

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXIV.—APRIL, 1909—No. 134.

WHAT HAPPENED AT THE REFORMATION?

MR. AUGUSTINE BIRRELL in one of his piquant essays discussed the question, "What Happened at the Reformation?" What did actually happen is not nearly so clear as many people have imagined, and the estimate of what was accomplished by the movement that is now coming to be rather generally known by the much less ambitious, but better descriptive title of "The Religious Revolt in Germany at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century" has changed very much in recent years. This is true even for those who still cling to the thought that the movement in religious matters initiated by Luther gave rise to new possibilities at least of great human progress. History in the last generation as the result of the introduction of scientific methods has become much more of an exact science than while it was so largely the personal review of events and their causes that the classic historians gave us. As a consequence, a great change has come over the face of history. The reason for this change has been the consultation of original documents, which has led to a definite remaking of history.

A hundred years ago the Comte de Maistre in his *Soirées de St. Petersburg* declared that "History for the last three centuries has been a conspiracy against the truth." Talking at the beginning of the nineteenth century, he meant to say that since the early fifteen hundreds, which saw the rise of the Reformation, there had been a concerted effort to write a particular viewpoint into history. De Maistre's expression was set down as a personal opinion by most

people at the time, but at the beginning of the twentieth century the editors of the "Cambridge Modern History" repeated his phrase almost literally when they said in the preface to their first volume that "the long conspiracy against the revelation of truth has gradually given way." They added that "the honest student finds himself continually deserted, retarded, misled by the classics of historical literature, and has to hew his own way through multitudinous transaction periodicals and official publications in order to reach the truth." Their conclusion is that "ultimate history cannot be obtained in this generation, but so far as documentary evidence is at command conventional history can be discarded and the point can be shown that has been reached on the road from one to the other."

Professional historians generally, meaning by that term writers of history who take the whole field of human endeavor in a particular era for their study, or at least are supposed to, have not as yet apparently realized some of these advances in history due to the work of those who have been consulting original documents in certain limited departments. This is an age of specialism, and many writers have devoted themselves to one small portion of the field of history for a definite period and have, it is to be presumed, gotten as near to the actual truth of happenings in that particular time as it is possible to attain after the lapse of years. It so happens that for lecture purposes striking expressions of a number of these specialists which concern the influence of the Reformation in their own departments have collected in my note book. Most of the writers are not Catholics, and some of them, indeed, proclaim themselves followers of the movement of protest against the Catholic Church initiated at the Reformation, yet have found the effects of that movement in their own specialty to have been very different from what they had been taught or what they anticipated when they began their study. It has seemed to me that others might find use for these expressions, and that some idea of the striking change of view with regard to the Reformation which is coming over many serious students of special subjects may serve to illustrate how great is the modification of history in this matter that is setting in.

The most striking expressions that occur concern the five great modes of the expression of man's intellectual life, and may therefore be most readily arranged under art, education, philosophy, religion and humanitarian purpose. It happens that in my notes one or more concise illuminating passages occur with regard to each of these modalities of thought and life. The consideration of them may serve at least to make people who are confident that the Reformation stood for benefit to mankind in all or most of these departments of human effort realize that those who have studied the

subjects with most care have often come to quite other conclusions, and may suggest the need for further study of the important question as to what really did happen as a consequence of the Reformation.

Almost invariably, it would seem, the writers who in recent years have investigated but a single phase of human interest, in which they themselves are intensely occupied, find that, far from the Reformation, so-called, representing a beneficent influence, it always meant a serious setback for true progress. To take up art as the initial subject because of its many-sided appeal—there is no doubt at all in the mind of any one who knows anything about the history of art or has any proper data for forming a judgment in the matter, that decadence in art has been the rule since the Reformation time. The greatest influence in the art life of Europe was the Church, and with the Reformation that died in all the countries affected by the German religious movement. There was almost absolute sterility of great art in practically all the Protestant countries for the next two centuries.

This has, of course, often been said, but never more emphatically than since the revival of interest in Gothic art and architecture. Gerhardt Hauptmann, who shares with Sudermann the honor of being Germany's greatest living dramatist, and who is considered by many competent critics as probably the deepest thinker among the German literary men of the present generation, has recently given very forcible expression to his views in this matter. It is, of course, from the standpoint of the artist that he has looked into the question, and has found so much that is astonishing to him that he feels bound to deprecate, even though it may injure his prestige in Protestant Germany.

He said not long since: "I as a Protestant have often had to regret that we purchased our freedom of conscience, our individual liberty at entirely too high a price. In order to make room for small, mean little plants of personal life, we destroyed a whole garden of fancy and hewed down a virgin forest of æsthetic ideas. We went even so far in the insanity of our weakness as to throw out of the garden of our souls the fruitful soil that had been accumulating for thousands of years, or else we plowed it under sterile clay.

"We have to-day, then, an intellectual life that is well protected by a hedge of our personality, but within this hedge we have only delicate dwarf trees and unworthy plants, the progeny of great predecessors. We have telegraph lines, bridges and railroads, but there grow no churches and cathedrals, only sentry boxes and barracks. We need gardeners who will cause the present sterilizing process of the soil to stop, and will enrich the surface by working up into it the rich layers beneath. In my workroom there is ever

before me the photograph of Sebald's tomb. This rich German symbol arose from the invisible in the most luxurious developmental period of German art. As a formal product of that art it is very difficult to appreciate it as it deserves. It seems to me one of the most beautiful bits of work in the whole field of artistic accomplishment. The soul of all the great mediæval periods enwraps this silver coffin, giving to it a noble unity, and enthrones on the very summit, Death, Life as a growing child. Such a work could only have come to its perfection in the protected spaces of the Old Mother Church."

It is frequently said that we owe our modern education mainly to the "Reformation." Men who talk thus as a rule know nothing at all about what had been done before this time, and attribute all that came after to the influence of the movement initiated by Luther. They forget apparently that even whatever of education Luther himself had which enabled him to accomplish the work he did, was given him by the old Church. It is somewhat like proclaiming Luther as the first translator of the Bible into German, though there were fourteen editions of the Bible *in German* printed before his time. Those who have studied the "Reformation" period most closely harbor no such illusions with regard to its initiation of or even its encouragement of education. One of the best living authorities on education in Germany is Professor Paulsen, who holds the chair of philosophy at the University of Berlin. His book on the "History of German Education" was translated into English and is published with an introduction by President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia. One does not have to go very far in it before finding Paulsen's opinion with regard to the influence of the "Reformation" on education. He says: "After 1520, Humanism, an aristocratic and secular impulse, was overtaken and succeeded by a movement of vastly greater power and depth, the religious and popular movement of the Reformation. For a brief space the Reformation may well have seemed a reinforcement of Humanism, united as both these were in their hatred of scholastic philosophy and of Rome. Hutton and Luther are represented in pamphlets of the year 1520 as the two great champions of freedom. Inwardly, however, they were very different men, and very different were the goals to which they sought to lead the German people. Luther was a man of inward anti-rationalistic and anti-ecclesiastical religious feeling, and Hutton a man of rationalistic and libertinistic humanism. Hutton did not live to see the manifestation of this great contrast; but after 1522 or 1523, the eyes of the Humanists were open to the fact, and almost without exception they turned away from the Reformation as from something yet more hostile to learning than the

Old Church herself. (Italics ours.) In very truth it appeared for the time as if the Reformation would be in its effects essentially hostile to culture. In the fearful tumults between 1520 and 1530 the universities and schools came to an almost complete standstill, and with the Church fell the institutions of learning which she had brought forth, so that Erasmus might well say, 'Where Lutheranism reigns, there is an end of letters.'"

Those who hold a brief for the Reformation and its supposed benign influence on education may be tempted to retort that at least the German religious movement gave liberty of teaching to the German University. It is a constantly emphasized Protestant tradition that the incubus of the Church on teaching institutions before this time had been most serious in its consequences, and that developments in education had been prevented because of this. Those who assume that the reformers so-called introduced academic liberty into Germany will find very little support for any such claim in Professor Paulsen. Paulsen insists that exactly the opposite is true, and that far from bringing freedom of thought, the new religious movement still further shackled university and teaching freedom and the liberty of speech and writing, so that a sadly stilted period of educational development comes on the scene in Germany. He talks from the standpoint of his own department of philosophy, and evidently resents the shackles that were placed on freedom of speculation at this period.

"During this period also a more determined effort was made to control instruction than at any period before or since. The fear of heresy, the extra anxiety to keep instruction well within orthodox lines was not less intense at the Lutheran than at the Catholic institutions—perhaps it was even more so, because here doctrine was not so well established, apostasy was possible in either of two directions, Catholicity or Calvinism. Even the philosophic faculty felt the pressure of this demand for correctness of doctrines. Thus came about these restrictions within the petty States and their narrow-minded established churches which well nigh stifled the intellectual life of the German people."¹

Since the expression of these views by the distinguished professor of philosophy of the University of Berlin most of those interested in education in English-speaking countries have adopted this manner of thinking, and as a consequence we have not only heard much less of the supposed beneficial effect of the Reformation on education, but have frequently encountered expressions of the

¹ "The German Universities and University Study," by Fried Paulsen, professor of philosophy in the University of Berlin. Translated by Thilly, Scribner's, 1906.

opposite point of view. One is not surprised then to find in Mr. George Haven Putnam's "The Censorship of the Church of Rome" (New York, 1906) a paragraph like the following, which helps one to realize the reasons for the intellectual sterility of Germany during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries better than anything else that we know. Mr. Putnam says (p. 45):

"While in this direction of controversy the Reformation had a stimulating effect on the intellectual interests of a number of European States, it may be admitted that in certain respects its influence upon literature was hampering and restricting rather than elevating. In the countries in which the Protestant opinions secured control there was for a considerable period at least a decided setback to the study of the classics and to all literary production outside of the domain of theology or religion. The interest in classical literature which had been initiated in Italy under the so-called Renaissance and in connection with the rediscovery of the great works of Greece was for a time lost sight of in the Protestant States of Germany and of the Netherlands and among the Calvinists of France and of England. Classic writers were classed as 'pagans' and their works were discouraged as likely to have a worldly influence on the minds of the faithful. The work in the universities in these States was, outside of the theological faculties, more and more restricted to what might be called utilitarian channels. The textbooks planned by Melancthon and his associates were of distinctive service for elementary education, and undoubtedly represented a material advance over the books of the same grade which had been utilized for the elementary Catholic school. For a considerable period, however, the educational advance stopped with this elementary work; *and in the universities there was a lack of higher grade teaching and a narrowing of the whole course of training.*" (Italics ours.)

With regard to religion itself, and the reformation that is supposed to have come in it, and the characters of those prominent in the reform movement as contrasted with those who remained in the Church, one recent opinion is quite as startling, when it is remembered that it comes from a prominent divine still outside of the Catholic Church, as any of those which I have already quoted. Rev. Dr. Charles Briggs in an article in the *Independent* (New York, 1904) bearing the title "How We May Become More Truly Catholic," expressed his views as to certain personages of the Reformation period who are recognized as the most prominent leaders on both sides of that great movement. He had no hesitation in saying that those who stayed in the Catholic Church were even better, more admirable men, greater geniuses intellectually, more profoundly

religious, more saintly in their piety, and that there can be no doubt at all of their perfect good faith and unselfish devotion to Christianity in their determination to remain in the Church at that time. The passage is one that deserves to be in the note book of all those who are interested in this period, with regard to which there are so many contrasting opinions, for it is a very wonderful compliment, coming from one who knows that period well, yet has not found himself compelled by the logic of the situation to enter the Catholic Church. Rev. Dr. Briggs said:

"There were other and in some respects greater reformers in the sixteenth century than the more popular heroes, Luther, Zwingli and Calvin. Sir Thomas More, the great jurist of his time, Lord Chancellor of England, a chief leader of reform before Cromwell, resigned his exalted position and went to the block rather than recognize the supreme authority of the King in ecclesiastical affairs, a true knight, a martyr to the separation of the sybil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Erasmus, the greatest scholar of his age, regarded by many as the real father of the Reformation, the teacher of the Swiss reformers, was unwilling to submerge learning and morals in an ocean of human blood. He urged reformation, not revolution. He has been crucified for centuries in popular Protestant opinion as a politic time server, but undoubtedly he was the most comprehensive reformer of them all. John Von Staupitz, doctor of theology, vicar general of the Augustinian Order, the teacher of Luther and his counsellor in the early stages of his reform, a man without stain and above reproach, a saint in the common estimation of Protestant and Catholic alike, the best exponent of the piety of his age, was an apostle of holy love and good works which he would not sacrifice in the interests of the Protestant dogma of justification by faith only.

"These three immortals, who did not separate themselves from the Roman Catholic Church, who remained in the Church to patiently carry on the work of reform therein—these three were the irenic spirits, the heroic representatives of all that is truly Catholic, the beacons of the Greater Reformation that is impending."

After the revival in art which has characterized the end of the nineteenth century, the most striking phase of our social progress in recent times has been the growth of humanitarian effort. The last generation woke up to the realization of its duty towards its fellow-men and also to the fact that organization was needed to care for the needy, the ailing and the halt and the blind. The consequence has been the building of magnificent hospitals, the organization of charity and the training of men and women who take up the special duties of helping all who deserve it. A direct result of this

new interest in things humanitarian has been a desire to know more about what was accomplished in these lines in the past. Histories of hospitals, of nursing organizations and of nursing itself as a great institution have multiplied in every language, and every step of progress in this kind of history has led these specialists to the truth that there had been a magnificent organization of charity and an adequate endowment of it in the best possible way before the Reformation. The three centuries since, down to our own time, are in these respects to a large extent a blank in Protestant countries, and only in Catholic countries does one find properly organized effort for the care of those who need help.

A "History of Nursing," recently published here in America, is written by Miss Nutting, the superintendent of nurses at Johns Hopkins Hospital and lecturer at Teachers' College, Columbia University, and Miss Dock, secretary of the American Federation of Nurses and of the International Council of Nurses. These women began their history with the idea that organized nursing was a comparatively modern institution. They have found, however, that the nursing orders in the Catholic Church represent admirable organization of nursing, and so their first volume has many tributes to these nursing orders. The nursing Sisters in Canada did magnificent work in their hospitals here in America long before modern ideas of nursing came in, and there were Catholic institutes for every phase of physical need. All this, of course, is a commonplace to educated Catholics. It may come as a surprise to others, as it was apparently to these historians of nursing.

The most striking chapter in this "History of Nursing" is that one in which "The Dark Period of Nursing" is treated. Probably most people would expect that the dark period of nursing in modern history would come some time during the Middle Ages, or at least in some distant century. Most of us in the modern time are prone to harbor the notion, consciously or unconsciously, of progress in things human and to consider that as we are "the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time," we are, of course, in everything ever so much farther advanced than the preceding generations, and that each preceding generation was far ahead of its predecessors. In spite of the dissillusionments for any such notion that are ever at hand in literature and art, men still continue to cherish this as a sort of postulate. In nursing, as in art, progress cannot be traced from the earlier times down to our own, but there is a sad break for some two centuries. These centuries constitute the dark period in nursing. *They begin with the middle of the seventeenth century and end with the middle of the nineteenth.*

The authors of the "History of Nursing" declare, not on their

own opinion alone, but as the result of the consultation of all the authorities on this subject, that "it is commonly agreed that the darkest known period in the history of nursing was that from the latter part of the seventeenth up to the middle of the nineteenth century. During this time the condition of the nursing art, the well-being of the patient and the status of the nurse, all sank to an indescribable level of degradation."

Ten years ago a German writer on the history of nursing who with Teutonic thoroughness had looked into the question very profoundly came to the same conclusion and expressed it in words even more striking than those of Miss Nutting and Miss Dock just quoted. Jacobson in his "Essays on the History of Comforts for the Sick," which appeared in the German *Journal for the Care of the Ailing*,² says that "it is a remarkable fact that attention to the well-being of the sick, improvements in hospitals and institutions generally and to details of nursing care had a period of complete and lasting stagnation after the middle of the seventeenth century, or from the close of the Thirty Years' War. Neither physicians nor officials took any interest in the elevation of nursing or in improving the conditions of hospitals. During the first two-thirds of the eighteenth century," he proceeds to say, "nothing was done to bring either construction or nursing to a better state. Solely among the religious orders did nursing remain an interest, and some remnants of the technique survive. The result was that in this period the general level of nursing fell far below that of earlier periods. The hospitals of cities were like prisons, with bare, undecorated walls and little dark rooms, small windows where no sun could enter and dismal wards where fifty or one hundred patients were crowded together, deprived of all comforts and even of necessities. In the municipal and State institutions of this period the beautiful gardens, roomy halls and springs of water of the odd cloister hospital of the Middle Ages were not heard of, still less the comforts of their friendly interiors."

It is rather interesting to find the reason given by the American authors of the "History of Nursing" for this decadence in humanitarian efforts. They declare that it was not by chance, but that it was the result of the subjection of women which came into history at this time. There is no doubt at all that this is one of the foremost factors. It is itself, however, not a primary, but a secondary cause. The subjection of women was due directly to the ideas that came in at the time of the "Reformation." As the authors themselves show, this was not true in Catholic countries, and the conse-

² "Beitrage zur Geschichte des Krankencomforts."—Deutsche Krankenpflege Zeitung, 1898.

quence was that many nursing orders were organized during these centuries in Catholic countries, some of which exist yet and all of which did and are doing excellent work. In the Protestant countries, however, women had no opportunities to express themselves. As they say: "In all of the hospital and nursing work of the Christian era, this was the period of the most complete and general masculine supremacy. At no time before or since have women been quite without voice in hospital management and organization; but during this degraded period they were all but silenced. The ultimate control of the nursing staff, of their duties, their discipline and conditions of living was everywhere taken definitely from the hands of women and lodged firmly in those of men. Even where a woman still apparently stood at the head of a nursing body she was only a figurehead, with no power to alter conditions, no province that she could call her own. The state of degeneration to which men reduced the art of nursing during this time of their unrestricted rule, the general contempt to which they brought the nurse, the misery which the patient thereby suffered, bring a scathing indictment against the ofttime reiterated assertion of man's superior effectiveness and teach in every branch of administration a lesson that for the sake of the poor, the weak and suffering members of society ought never to be forgotten—not in resentment, but in foresight, it should be remembered. Neither sex, no one group, no one person can ever safely be given supreme and undivided authority. Only when men and women work together as equals, dividing initiative, authority and responsibility, can there be any avoidance of the serfdom that in one form or another has always existed where arbitration domination has been present, and which acts as a depressant, effectually preventing the best results in work."

It would be at once said by most people that if this last sentence is to be taken seriously, and if we are to accept that only when men and women work together as equals, dividing initiative, authority and responsibility, can there be any real progress in liberty of spirit and accomplishment, then we must not look to Catholic conditions for such progress, since the spirit of the Church is to separate the sexes in the religious orders and let them work quite apart for whatever is to be accomplished. People who say this, however, either do not know or have forgotten the history of the beginnings of nearly every great movement for intellectual and humanitarian progress in the Catholic Church. Beside a great man in every one of those movements there stands a woman whose name is only less highly honored than his, and sometimes her reputation is even greater than his. For the foundation of the Irish schools St. Brigid is only less great than St. Patrick himself, and what she did for

education and civilization in Ireland counts for almost as much. Beside St. Benedict in the foundation of the West stands his sister, St. Scholastica; beside St. Francis stands St. Clare; beside St. Teresa in the great intellectual movement of the counter-formation of Spain, for here a woman is the greater of the two, stands St. John of the Cross; in the most important nursing movement in modern times beside St. Vincent de Paul stands Mme. Le Gras, the co-founders of the Sisters of Charity; beside St. Francis de Sales, as is noted in the "History of Nursing," stands St. Jane Frances de Chantal.

Nowhere in history is the coördination of masculine and feminine effort for the accomplishment of great works for mankind better illustrated than in the annals of nursing and nursing orders in the Catholic Church. Nothing is more true than that the individualism, which is such a prominent note of the Reformation period, at first manifests itself only in the men, and woman fails to occupy for several centuries as high a place as she did in the Christianity of the period before the Reformation. The real cause of the decadence in nursing and of the degeneration of hospitals and hospital appointments is to be found in quite another phase of history. What the reformers did principally was to destroy the religious orders and confiscate the money that had been left for the care of the poor and the ailing by preceding generations. This has been stated very strikingly by the Rev. Augustus Jessupp, who has made a very faithful study of parish life in England before the Reformation. The Rev. Mr. Jessupp, who is the rector of Scarning, in England, and who is an honorary fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and of Worcester College, Oxford, and an honorary canon in the Cathedral of Norwich, still remains a member of the Anglican Church, and therefore his opinion should have all the weight of a man who has been forced by the evidence of facts gathered by himself to see the amount of harm that was accomplished by the Reformation, so-called, in England. He does not call it the Reformation, but calls it *The Great Pillage*. His series of essays are grouped together under the name "Before the Great Pillage."³ Indignation has made him write very bitterly about the supreme injustice that was done to the poor of England and the immense amount of suffering that occurred as a consequence. He says:

"Let me, however, at this point explain what I do not mean when I talk about the Great Pillage. I have little or nothing to say in these papers when I talk about the suppression of monasteries; I do not touch upon that; I am very little concerned with that. When I talk about the Great Pillage, I mean that horrible and outrageous

³ London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1901.

looting of our churches other than conventual, and the robbing of the people of this country of property and movables, which property had actually been inherited by them as members of those organized religious communities known as parishes. It is necessary to emphasize the fact that in the general scramble of the Terror under Henry VIII., and of the Anarchy in the days of Edward VI., there was only one class that was permitted to retain any large portion of its endowments. The monasteries were plundered, even to their very pots and pans. The almshouses, in which old men and women were fed and clothed, were robbed to the last pound, the poor almsfolk being turned out in the cold at an hour's warning to beg their bread. The splendid hospitals for the sick and needy, sometimes magnificently provided with nurses and chaplains, whose very *raison d'être* was that they were to look after and care for those who were past caring for themselves, these were stripped of all their belongings, the inmates sent out to hobble into some convenient dry ditch to lie down and die in, or to crawl into some barn or hovel, there to be tended, not without fear of consequences, by some kindly man or woman who could not bear to see a suffering fellow-creature drop down and die at their own doorposts."

He proceeds:

"We talk with a great deal of indignation of the Tweed ring. The day will come when some one will write the story of the two other rings; the ring of the miscreants who robbed the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. was the first, but the ring of the robbers who robbed the poor and helpless in the reign of Edward VI. was ten times worse than the first."

All of these expressions, which have been accumulating for many years now, culminate in what Dr. Gairdner has to say in many of his books and which reached the very acme of expression in his last volume on Lollardy. In this Dr. Gairdner rubs out nearly every reason that is usually advanced in justification of the so-called Reformation in England. All fair-minded Englishmen have in recent years recognized that the movement that led to the break from Rome in England in the first half of the sixteenth century was not essentially religious, but was really political, and the best excuse for it was that it was a national declaration of independence of Rome and Italian ecclesiasticism. The late Bishop Creighton, so fair-minded in many ways with regard to the history of the Church and, above all, of the Popes before the Reformation so-called, clung to this as the last spar from the shipwreck of the bark of religious reformation which the separators from Rome are supposed to have launched. For him the English Reformation, then, was a great national revolution. He was ready to confess that there was many

unfortunate circumstances connected with this revolution, but still the spirit of national independence with which it was undertaken justified it. It is this position which has since been occupied by many thinking Englishmen that is now utterly destroyed by Dr. Gairdner in his last book. He says:

"One whom we might well take as a guide considers the Reformation as 'a great national revolution which found expression in the resolute assertion on the part of England of its national independence.'⁴ These are the words of the late Bishop Creighton, who further tells us in the same page that 'there never was a time in England when the Papal authority was not resented, and really the final act of repudiation of that authority followed quite naturally as the result of a long series of similar acts which had taken place from the earliest times.' I am sorry to differ from so able, conscientious and learned an historian, and my difficulty in contradicting him is increased by the consciousness that in these passages he expresses not his own opinion merely, but one to which Protestant writers have been generally predisposed. But can any such statements be justified? Was there anything like a general dislike of the Roman jurisdiction in Church matters before Roman jurisdiction was abolished by Parliament to please Henry VIII.? Or did the nation before that day believe that it would be more independent if the Pope's jurisdiction were replaced by that of the King? I fail, I must say, to see any evidence of such a feeling in the copious correspondence of the twenty years preceding; I fail to find it even in the prosecutions of heretics and the articles charged against them—from which, though a certain number may contain denunciations of the Pope as Antichrist, it would be difficult to infer anything like a general desire for the abolition of his authority in England. . . .

"That Rome exercised her spiritual power by the willing obedience of Englishmen in general, and that they regarded it as a really wholesome power, even for the control it exercised over secular tyranny, is a fact which it requires no very intimate knowledge of early English literature to bring home to us. . . . *It was only after an able and despotic King had proved himself stronger than the spiritual power of Rome that the people of England were divorced from their Roman allegiance; and there is abundant evidence that they were divorced from it at first against their will.*"

In spite of this startling conclusion, as it must surely be for Protestants generally, Dr. Gairdner himself remains outside the Church, so that his evidence must be allowed all the weight that the admissions of an opponent convinced against his wish ever carry.

According to these Protestant writers, each of them a specialist

⁴ "Historical Lectures and Addresses," p. 150.

and recognized authority in his own line of investigation, far from the Reformation having worked the manifold good that has been so often proclaimed, or having been the manifestation of popular dissatisfaction with Rome it is declared, it seriously hurt the best human effort so far as their special departments are concerned, and it was a backward, not a forward movement in every way. Each of them, I suppose, since they remain outside the Church, would hold that while the Reformation was distinctly a failure so far as their own investigations went, in other departments it must have been a great factor for good, because so many people still insist on thinking of it as a great source of benefit to humanity. It used to be said of Herbert Spencer that scientists all thought him a great thinker in all departments of science except their own. A composite picture of him, made from the estimation in which he was held by scientific specialists because of his wanderings into their departments, would be very far from favorable to him, however.

It would seem to be time for us to secure a composite picture of the Reformation, made not by historians who try to look at the whole subject, which is too large for any one man as yet, but derived from the carefully elaborated opinions formed by special students. Some of the material at least for such a composite picture, I think, may be obtained from these pages from my note book, though it is almost needless to say that it would be comparatively easy to add to these quotations others almost as striking couched in similar terms without going farther afield than the Protestant writers of history of the last ten years.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York City, N. Y.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF THE FUTURE.

IS THE twentieth century to witness before its close the passing away of the religion of Christ? Prophetic whisperings would have it so. More than a year ago there appeared an article in one of our well-known reviews,¹ in which a venerable and noted scholar confessed his fears for the well-being of religion in the near future, and even for the existence of Christianity itself. Convinced that modern science is a sure enemy to anything supernatural, and realizing the rapid advance of all departments of science, he concludes that the end of Christianity cannot be very far off. And he

¹ "The Religious Situation," by Goldwin Smith, *North American Review* for April, 1908.

gives practical demonstration of the validity of his argument in the increasing skeptical tendency of the Christian mind on all religious topics, and the increasing number of those whom this skepticism has led to throw off all semblance of religious belief. Fortified with these considerations he boldly intimates (though always in a tone of submissive inquiry) that the next generation will see this change, and that the Christianity of to-day will then be in its grave.

A year has now passed. Has it shown any further indications of the fulfillment of the prophesied change? The facts that present themselves tend to confirm us in the opinion that the prophetic conclusions of the writer have, like many other statements, something of truth in them, but something of error as well. No one would deny that the present age is abounding in skeptical theorism, and that the road to irreligion is wide and well traversed. But to conclude from this that Christianity in its entirety is to fall in ruins manifests an inaccuracy of observation or a defect in logical conclusion. This our view is founded on facts and not on theorized hypotheses. Facts and figures, indeed, seem to confirm the **general** statement of the writer, but facts and figures also prove that there is a remarkable exception to his general conclusions, and one that must not be overlooked. For there is among the Christian sects one which bears not the marks that betoken the prophesied dissolution and decay.

Outside the Catholic Church it is true the Christian mind is in an unsettled state of doubt and hesitation, and the result that has been predicted with fear is rapidly taking place. But the Church of Rome is bound together with saving bonds that show no sign of loosening their hold. Demonstration of former of these statements is hardly necessary after the convincing article of Goldwin Smith, and while the cries of the very leaders of Protestantism are heard on all sides foreboding the passing of their sects. This movement away from God is not a movement of yesterday. Its roots are laid even deeper than the words of Goldwin Smith seem to indicate. It is the natural product of the principles of the Reformation. We of America, who are further away from the source and influence of these principles, are proportionately more cautious in adopting their logical conclusions. Yet we are following slowly in the path traced out by European countries.

Protestant Germany, the original disseminator of these principles, has long since become the hotbed of atheism, materialism and infidelity. Even in the days of Newman a Scotch Presbyterian writer could say that "the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches in Germany and Switzerland are in reality extinct. The sense of religion, its influence on the habits, observances and life of the people, is alive

only in the Roman Catholic population.”² And half a century later a writer in the *Edinburgh Review* could assert that “the land which was the cradle of the Reformation has become the grave of the Reformed Faith. Denial of every tenet of the Protestant faith among the thinking classes and indifference in the masses are the positive and negative agencies beneath which the Church of Luther and Melancthon has succumbed. In contiguous parishes of Catholic and Protestant populations one invariable distinction has long been potent to all eyes—the path to the Catholic Church is trodden bare; that to the Protestant Church is rank with grasses and weeds to the very door.”³

The influence of this movement is now being felt in America. By nature we are a God-fearing people. We print on our coins that we “trust in God,” and in the beginning at least this was the expression of our heart’s inmost thought. But now belief in God is fast fading out of the hearts of many, and they are drifting away from the Christian fold. Had we no other example before our eyes, we would point to Goldwin Smith himself. Forty years ago, according to his own words delivered as an Oxford lecturer, he firmly believed in the God of Christians; now he confesses he can no longer cling to any such superstitious relics of the past. Nay, he is very active, considering his years, in making his changed views known to the world at large. He even tries to convince us that all men are following in his tracks, and that all religious dogma and supernatural creed are fast becoming myths of a former age. “Apparently,” he says, “it (religious belief) is now departing. In some places it appears to have fled. Skepticism with social unrest comes in its room.”⁴

This much is certain, if we are to judge from his article, that in Goldwin Smith’s mind at least there is very little room for religious belief. He is a religious skeptic, and a professed religious skeptic in the bitterest sense of the term. Protestantism, the religion of his forefathers, no longer appeals to his reasoning mind. And he is not altogether illogical in his position. For he realizes the folly of trusting himself in the journey of life to a vessel whose hulk is already filled with holes, through which the angry waves are rushing, whose only propelling power is the breeze the sailors raise by puffing out their cheeks. But neither is he perfectly logical, or he would clamber up the side of the steady and safe vessel near at hand, which is bound for the haven and will infallibly arrive there. But no! he rather chooses to give up all hope of accomplishing the journey.

² Laing, “Notes on the German Catholic Church,” p. 145.

³ *Edinburgh Review*, October, 1880.

⁴ *North American Review*, April, 1908.

He even tries to convince himself that there is no journey to be made, and is content to remain behind on the barren shore. For this he is to be pitied rather than condemned. The best good we can do for men like this is to recommend them to the tender mercy and the long suffering patience of their God.

Fortunately for the world and for our stand in the present discussion, this is not the only outcome of that skepticism in which all thinking Protestants are wandering. Even among the Greeks there were two classes of skeptics. The one with Arcesilaus at the head not only confessed that they had not found the truth, but claimed it could not possibly be attained; the other, under Pyrrho, acknowledged, indeed, that they had not as yet come upon the truth, but they did not claim it to be out of the reach of man. In fact, their one object in life was to seek out this truth. It is the same among the religious skeptics of to-day, and there are many among them who are now hot on the trail of truth.

These are men whose minds are more sensitive to fact and doctrine, who may indeed be prejudiced, but who will recognize truth when met with face to face; who will not follow blindly in the footsteps of their ancestors without first being sure that their ancestors' footsteps lead aright. And yet many of these are still lost in skeptic doubt. Before the world they appear as devoted dogmatists, men who hold a definite system of religion and confide in it with all their heart, but secretly they admit that a detailed presentation of their beliefs is something beyond their power to give; that dogma is unstable and liable to change with the day, and thus within their hearts they are true religious skeptics. Newman's words of himself are peculiarly adapted to their state of mind: "How was I any more to have confidence in myself? How was I to have confidence in my present confidence? How was I to be sure that I would always think as I thought now? Nay, how could I with satisfaction to myself analyze my own mind and say what I held and what I did not, or say with what limitations, shades of difference or degrees of belief I held that body of opinions which I openly professed and taught?"⁵

Our most illustrious example of this class of skeptics is Cardinal Newman himself, who so minutely details in his "Apologia" the changings of his conscience during the years before his conversion. But for us Americans, a lengthened Apologia from the leader of the Oxford Movement would produce far less effect than a few simple words of explanation from the thirty or more Protestant ministers who have joined the Catholic Church in this country within the last twelve months, and especially from the seven noted converts to

⁵ "Apol.," pp. 132 and 168.

Catholicity in Philadelphia. Let us hope that we will hear in time from their own mouths whether or not our general proposition held true in their individual cases—that all along their minds were yearning for something they could not find, and that they can say with Newman, "I must have had something of an habitual notion, though it was latent and had never led me to distrust my own convictions, that my mind had not found its ultimate rest, and that in some sense or other I was on a journey."⁶

But while we wait we need not be idle. Theirs was a brave and daring act. It was the most important religious event of its kind for many years, and its consequences are left only for the future to tell. It has been called the "New Oxford Movement," and not without reason. But to our minds it should not be called the *New* Oxford Movement, but rather the regular continuation of the *Old*, and it is in this light rather than any other that we would view this unusual manifestation of the deep-rootedness of religious belief in the hearts of men. To call it a *new* movement would to our minds imply that there had been a lapse in the *old*; to say that Dr. McGarvey and his friends had started a new exodus from Protestantism to Catholicism would mean that the old exodus had come to an end. And this, we maintain, is far from the truth; nay, so far from the truth that during the year 1907, before Dr. McGarvey had been convinced, the conversions from Protestantism to Catholicity, within the boundaries of our own United States, numbered 25,000 souls.

If this late movement were an entirely new movement toward the Church, having its inception in the bold move of those Anglican ministers of Philadelphia, we would have to reconsider some of the statements we have made about the logical accuracy of Goldwin Smith's conclusions. We might even have to retract our words. For Goldwin Smith writing in March could not prophesy what would happen in May. He could not foresee the remarkably strong statistical disapprobation of his views about the general lapse of Christianity into materialism and atheism. Nor could he be blamed for not conjecturing a movement which threw into consternation the very friends and fellow-worshippers of these "Companions of the Holy Saviour."

So if Goldwin Smith or any of his friends would show that they, or any other person of ordinary or extraordinary introspective capabilities, looking out upon the religious situation in the United States during the year ending with the month of March, 1908, could affirm with perfect sincerity and logical consistency that all Christian religions were showing signs of coming dissolution; that all men were beginning to understand that our trust in the supernatural was

⁶ "Apol.," p. 144.

becoming weaker and weaker, and that the tide of religious belief was towards him and his skeptic disbelief without any notable exception, without one *Rock* standing in the midst of the waves and breasting the tides and tempests with an easy strength, then we will gladly make haste to recall our words and confess that we charged a fellow-man with logical inaccuracy when we should have applauded him for his far-sighted introspective ability.

However, though we cannot blame the venerable historian for not possessing the gift of prophecy, we can and do blame him for presuming to usurp it. In no ambiguous terms, but explicitly and authoritatively, he states that though everything else which he has predicted may be a long time in fulfillment, the "one great change in the ecclesiastical world which appears to be at hand" is the fall of the Papacy and the disintegration of the Roman Catholic Church. He states as a very probable truth that there is in general no Christian religion showing any signs but those of dissolution and decay; but he makes particular effort to declare that the Catholic Church in particular is fast following its Protestant companions, and is even leading the retreat from belief in the supernatural. It is the boldness and manifest falsity of this assertion that has drawn from us the present remonstrance.

When our esteemed essayist refers to the Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic religion as the "poor, quaking Pope," and instances the "Encyclical on Modernism" as ample proof of the weakening position of Pius X., even over his own Catholic subjects, he merely bespeaks the utter incapability of his skeptically nurtured mind to grasp the least vestige of the supernatural structure of the Church. He does not seem aware that this very manifestation of vigilant authority, this insistent investigation into the views and philosophical tendencies of his subjects, and his most practical remedies prescribed and enforced for their regulation or extirpation, is a sign not of weakness, but of strength; not of decaying age, but of flourishing youth. However, we can perhaps pardon these views in Goldwin Smith and attribute them to the deep-rooted prejudice of his early days.

But we cannot always thus find an excuse for his illogical conclusions. Prejudice may distort truths. But prejudice, no matter how deep it be, if supplemented by true reasoning, will never contradict itself. If it admits a truth, it will admit the conclusions consequent upon that truth. Yet this Goldwin Smith refuses to do, as we shall endeavor to show.

Yet it must be understood before we proceed any farther that we are not attempting to refute the innumerable objections against anything and everything bordering on religion that Goldwin Smith has

massed together in this article of his. That would require volumes. For, true to his skeptical attitude, he calls into question every religious truth and brings up the old objections against each one. We shall prescind from the intrinsic merit of these objections. We shall look at them rather from a logical point of view, inquiring into their coherency with one another and with the professed attitude of their author.

Goldwin Smith is skeptical about anything that approaches the supernatural. He is not a downright atheist, for he is not sure his misgivings are well founded; indeed, he seems to hope that they are not. But he is on the road to a complete denial of God. "Reason," he says with Bishop Butler, "is the only faculty we have to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself." And this reason teaches him that all revelation is null and void. It teaches him that the Old Testament has fallen before the onslaughts of modern science; that the New Testament is a heap of contradictory reports about a fictitious event. Hence, away with all superstitious belief! Away with religion as it exists to-day! Away with Christ, the so-called Son of God! For we can know nothing certain of all these things.

Yet religion is not altogether useless. For with the incoming of religious skepticism, as he himself declares, there will come "social unrest"—the social fabric may be shaken to its very foundations. So, for the sake of the beneficial effects upon mankind, though at the expense of logical consistency, we will not cast out religion altogether. We will, however, change its present aspect. After the fall of the Papacy we will look forward to "a reunion of Christendom on the broad moral basis of the Christian Ideal!"

Goldwin Smith realizes and acknowledges that religious belief is necessary for the order and happiness of mankind, yet he is willing to confess that this belief is a belief in a mythical unreality. He points out the influence of the supernatural on the heart of man, yet his reason does not force him to admit the existence of that supernatural. He is looking forward to a religion without religious belief; to a Christianity without Christ; to a devoted submission to the laws of God without a belief in the existence of God.

Filled with this thought of a new religion, he sees signs of the decaying of the old at every turn. In the private misgivings of clergy and laity and their struggles to reconcile orthodoxy with free thought; in the fact that heresy is no longer considered a crime before the law; in the increased prominence to musical attraction at religious service; in the secular tendencies of the Sunday sermon; in the wonderful strides of physical science; in every department of social and religious life he sees signs of coming dissolution.

But for once he has been too hasty in his conclusions. He does not seem aware that there is *one* religion which does not fit under his general definition. Yet there *is* one religious body which is not only not disturbed by his arguments, but which these very arguments serve only to support. There is one Church whose clergy do not bend before the oncoming of free thought, where orthodoxy still holds sway, where musical art is displayed not to please the critic's ear, but to raise the worshiping heart, where sermons deal not with topics of worldly interests, but are wholly absorbed with thoughts of the life beyond the grave. And that Church is the Church of Rome. And there is one faith to which every nation's history bears witness, and which physical discoveries and inventions have only tended to confirm, and that faith is the faith in a supernatural Creator. Every new discovery and every new physical law serves only to bring out the more clearly the marvelous order of the universe and the wonderful hidden power of Him who made it.

But prejudice and bad logic will scarcely be sufficient to explain away some of Goldwin Smith's statements. There must be something else. We do not wish to call it downright insincerity or wilful blindness, but we know no other name for it.

For now he enters upon his own long-studied fields of history and comments on the records of past ages. There, too, he sees signs of the coming dissolution! Comparing the past with the situation of to-day, he deduces conclusions such as these: That a Church which, while yet only a few handfuls of men, could break down the world-wide empire of the Cæsars and place itself triumphant upon their throne; a Church which for century after century withstood the incessant encroachments of political and private, foreign and home-bred foes, not only with success, but with a success that brought them all in humble submission before its feet; that a Church which could override a rebellion of such magnitude and persevering activity as had never before been read of in the annals of man; that a Church like this, with a history like this, need fear the intimations of a few scattered prophets of evil such as himself. We cannot excuse this blunder of his. We cannot blame it on blindness alone. We feel forced to attribute it to wilful malevolence. That an historian and professor like Goldwin Smith should declare that the existence of a religion which embraces all nations and has within its fold a quarter of a billion of men, one-half of all Christianity, is endangered because a Godless government of a once Catholic country has appropriated its property and persecuted its clergy, is a statement that can be accounted for only because the writer wilfully closes his eyes to the truth. And yet this is the only argument deserving of attention which he brings forward to substantiate his claim.

We cannot resist the temptation of quoting a well-known passage and comparing the judgment of a bitterly Protestant historian with the assertion of Goldwin Smith: "She (the Catholic Church) saw the commencement of all governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world, and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon set foot on Britain; before the Frank had passed the Rhine; when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch; when idols were still worshiped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand shall in the midst of a vast solitude take his stand on a broken arch of London bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's."⁷

Macaulay in no friendly spirit studied the history of the Church and the varied conflicts she has sustained, and this is his judgment concerning her future: "Four times since the authority of the Church of Rome was established in Western Christendom has the human intellect risen up against her. Twice she remained completely victorious. Twice she came forth from the conflict bearing the marks of cruel wounds, but with the principle of life still strong within her. When we reflect on the tremendous assaults which she has survived, we find it difficult to conceive in what way she is to perish."⁸

It is to be pitied that Goldwin Smith did not wait till the next issue of the *Review* to publish his article, for then perhaps he would have had more reason to modify his assertions. He would in the meantime have beheld 50,000 men marching through the metropolis of this country with the determined purpose of showing their loyalty to that "poor, quaking Pope," for whom he seemed to have so much compassion. He would have heard an eminent member of our country's Congress speaking before countless thousands in the largest assembly hall of that metropolis and openly professing his love and reverence for that Church. He would have read letters from Major, Governor and President, praising that Church and wishing its well-being in the future. He would, in short, have witnessed one of the greatest religious demonstrations ever held in the country. Would he then dare to say that that Church was falling in ruins?

Nor is this sort of religious demonstration confined to one corner of our land. New York is by no means unique in its demonstration. Fifty thousand line the streets of Baltimore to welcome home a revered Prince of that same Church; 50,000 assemble in St. Louis to lay a corner-stone for a Cathedral of that same Church; 50,000

⁷ Ranke's "History of the Papacy"—Macaulay.

⁸ *Ibid.*

fill the halls of England's metropolis to do honor to the solemn mysteries of that Church, and 50,000 march through New England's metropolis to show their reverence for the Name of the Founder of that Church. And all this in utter disregard of Goldwin Smith's careful calculations.

And yet Goldwin Smith was not altogether wrong. All that he said of the skeptical and materialistic tendencies of the age, and of the struggles of men to reconcile their consciences with their beliefs, is undoubtedly true of Christian religious sects outside the Catholic Church. And this explains the fact that during the past year so many thousands of their number have sought shelter within its fold. This makes it quite evident why so many leaders of Protestant sects are leaving their posts because they feel they were deceiving their flock. And it is this contrast between the skeptical unsettled attitude of the Protestant mind and the steadfast and unbending position of the Church of Rome which prompts us to assert that the "Christianity of the future" is to be identical with the Christianity of the far-off past, and that the time will come when the names "Christian" and "Catholic" will be used indiscriminately, as they were centuries ago before the rebellion of Luther.

FERDINAND W. HABERSTROH, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

THE PIONEER SCOTTISH SEMINARY.

MS. of Bishop John Geddes, 1777.

MS. of Rev. James Glennie, of Chapeltown, Glenlivat, 1841-1873.

Memoir of Bishop Hay by Rev. J. A. Stothert (Gordon's "Scotchchronicon," Appendix), 1860.

THE early part of the eighteenth century was a period of severe trial for the Catholics of Scotland. The Church had been roused to new life by the appointment in 1696, after more than a century of destitution, of a Bishop for the whole country. Rev. Thomas Nicholson, a priest of Scottish birth, who had suffered prison and exile for the faith during the early years of his missionary life, was consecrated at Paris as Bishop of Peristachium and constituted Vicar Apostolic of Scotland. On his way thither he was again seized and imprisoned in London, and it was at least a year after his nomination that he was able to take up his charge.

Persecution, which had never wholly ceased, though it might languish for brief periods, awoke in renewed strength at the acces-

sion of Anne to the throne of Great Britain. Bishop Nicholson, in his report to Propaganda in 1702, stated that the government had at heart the total extermination of the Catholic religion in Scotland.¹ A letter written about the same time, and preserved in the archives of Propaganda, describes an impious procession through the streets of Edinburgh, in which the common hangman, arrayed in sacerdotal vestments and bearing in one hand a consecrated chalice and in the other a crucifix, was the principal figure. These objects, together with other sacred spoils taken from Catholic houses, were burned amid blasphemies and execrations, after having been thus exposed to the derision of the populace.²

In March, 1704, the Queen issued a solemn proclamation commanding the enforcing of the laws regarding "Jesuits, priests, sayers of Mass, resettlers or harbourers of priests, or hearers of Mass." Rewards were offered for the apprehension of such offenders, and the ministers of the Kirk were exhorted to diligence in spying out all persons "suspected of Popery, or who have apostatized from the Protestant religion."³

Yet during a temporary lull the Vicar Apostolic was able to report to Rome in 1708 the conversion of many persons in the country.⁴ So flourishing became the state of Catholicism that it was a matter of impossibility for one Bishop to attend to the needs of a whole kingdom, and it became necessary to petition for the appointment of a coadjutor less than ten years after the nomination of Bishop Nicholson. As an instance of the arduous labors of the Vicar Apostolic, that prelate, during his first visitation of the Highlands in 1700, confirmed as many as three thousand persons; for the absence of a Bishop had rendered it impossible to administer that sacrament previously.

The request for a coadjutor was answered by the consecration in Rome of Bishop James Gordon, who received the title of Nicopolis. He arrived in Scotland in the autumn of 1706. The manifest growth of the Church led the Bishops to turn their attention to the need of providing a supply of missionary priests. The first step towards the establishment of a seminary was the opening of a small school on an island in Loch Morar, Inverness-shire. A secluded spot in the remote western district, whose sparse population consisted of Catholics, was purposely chosen; circumstances called for the utmost caution in such an undertaking. A few boys who showed

¹ Hunter-Blair, "History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 159.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. IV., p. 160.

³ "Miscellany of the Maitland Club," Vol. III., p. 392.

⁴ Hunter-Blair, "History of the Catholic Church in Scotland," Vol. IV., p. 164.

an aptitude for the priestly state were received here in 1713. Rev. George Innes, who later on became rector of the Scots College in Paris, was placed in charge. Among the few students who entered there was the son of the Laird of Morar. This youth, Hugh Macdonald, was destined to become the first Vicar Apostolic of the Highland District. The school had been but a short time opened when a renewal of persecution, following upon the Jacobite rising of 1715, seemed to threaten the destruction of Catholicism in Scotland, and compelled the Bishops to close the establishment until more peaceful days should dawn. An instance of the virulence of the persecuting party is to be seen in the arrest of Bishop Nicholson, together with a priest who resided with him, at a period when the agitation had already begun to cool down. Luckily, both were able to effect an escape.

It remained for Bishop Gordon, who in the failing health of the Vicar Apostolic had to take charge of the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland, to make a fresh attempt towards the foundation of a seminary. He wisely determined to make choice of a different locality, and fixed upon a farm known as Scalán, situated in Glenlivet, Banffshire, as a suitable spot.

Scalán was already the residence of a priest, for the Rev. John Gordon, missionary of Glenlivet, who had formerly dwelt at Castle-town, had been compelled to fly from the Hanoverian troops under General Cadogan, after the rising of 1715, and had taken refuge at Scalán, where he lived in a disused barn. The hidden nature of the place, and the fact that it was situated on the estate of the Catholic Duke of Gordon, made it a safe retreat for the priest, who was able in course of time to build a rude habitation by the side of the little stream known as the Crombie, and thence minister to the many faithful Catholics scattered over that part of the country.

The spot upon which Father Gordon settled had been at one time a waste covered with juniper, and its name of Scalán is said to be derived from a Gaelic word signifying the screens of bushes erected by hunters of the game which frequented the lonely spot, rendered a complete solitude by the high hills which shut it off from civilized life.

About the year 1717 a few students were lodged in the poor little hut which Father Gordon had built for himself, and which for at least twenty years served as a seminary for candidates for the Scottish mission. The same Father Innes who had presided over the humble college in Loch Morar was appointed superior of Scalán.

Bishop Gordon took a keen interest in everything pertaining to the little seminary. It was his delight to visit it from time to time, and it became his custom to spend there some months in each sum-

mer. In 1722 he drew up a code of rules for the students, based upon those of the Pontifical colleges. In this way the seminarists became accustomed to the way of life which awaited many of their number in one or other of the continental colleges later on; for from the beginning it had been recognized that the majority would have to repair thither for the completion of their studies. Some few, indeed, were promoted to Holy Orders without leaving Scotland. These in the history of Scalán and its successors, Aquahorties and Blairs, have borne the designation of "Heather Priests."

It was a glad day for the zealous Bishop when on Ember Saturday, 1725, he reaped the first fruits of his labors, for he then conferred the priesthood on two seminarists, Hugh Macdonald and George Gordon. The former, as already mentioned, became in after years the first Vicar Apostolic of the Highland District. He was consecrated Bishop in 1731, after a year or two spent in the Scots College, Paris. It is worthy of note that the then superior of Scalán was the person chosen by Bishop Gordon for the episcopate. This was Rev. Alexander Grant, who possessed a good knowledge of Gaelic and was in other respects suitable for the dignity. But, being averse to the proposal, not only through true humility, but also from the knowledge of his unpopularity with the Highland clergy, Father Grant, though persuaded to set out for Rome for consecration, managed to disappear so completely before the function could take place that for many years his whereabouts was utterly unknown to his friends in Scotland. For some years it was thought that he had met with some mortal accident, but a Scottish priest who happened to be passing through the south of France at a later period recognized the missing priest among a band of Trappist monks returning from field work, though he failed to obtain from him any answering sign of salutation. This fact is recorded in a MS. note of a venerable Scottish priest well known to the present writer.

About the year 1738 Rev. Alexander Gordon, who held the post of rector, succeeded in raising a more substantial dwelling of stone at Scalán. He was compelled to provide in some way for the increased number of students; for the boys destined for the priesthood had been joined from time to time by many others whose Catholic parents were anxious to procure for them a Christian education under orthodox teachers. They were mostly sons of various Scottish noble families. The establishment of a Catholic school for such boys in Strathavon during the early years of the same century relieved the seminary of many such students and provided accommodation for a larger number of boys with a vocation to the priesthood. The Strathavon school was presided over by a Mr. Gregory Farquharson, a former tutor to Cosmo, third Duke of

Gordon. The Duke's mother, after the death of his Catholic father, caused her children to be educated in the Protestant religion, and thus it came about that a younger brother of Cosmo was the notorious Lord George Gordon, the fomentor of the no-Popery riots.

The good Bishop Gordon went to his reward in the year 1746. It would seem as though he had been called away from this life in order to spare him the sight of the bitter calamities that followed in the wake of the defeat of the Stuart cause at Culloden. He died at Thornhill, near Drummond Castle, and before his body had been carried to the grave the castle, which was a residence of the Jacobite Dukes of Perth, was raided by Hanoverian soldiers. Worse still, Scalan, the Bishop's darling charge, was to suffer grievously in the miseries which were to fall upon the unhappy Catholics of Scotland.

The Duke of Cumberland, to make sure that his late adversaries should be unable to rally after their crushing defeat, sent out bands of soldiers in all directions to extinguish, as the phrase ran, the remnants of rebellion. One such party entered Glenlivat and made straight for Scalan, a place particularly obnoxious to the Presbyterian clergy, who at the time had great influence with the government. Two or three times previously, in 1726 and 1728, Scalan had been closed for brief intervals through the persecuting zeal of the Kirk, but only to reopen its doors.

The visit was not altogether unexpected. Father Duthie, the superior, had already taken the precaution of dismissing the boys to their respective homes, and had hidden away all priestly vestments, chalices, sacred objects, books and such other movables as he could hastily gather together. So prudently was this accomplished that scarcely anything thus concealed was lost.

It was on a morning in early May that the soldiers surrounded the little house, now deserted by its inmates. Father Duthie from the security of a neighboring hill saw everything given to the flames and watched the progress of the fire until the roof had fallen in and the utter ruin of the seminary was completed. He did not lose courage, however, in spite of the wreck of his home and of the threats of the Protestant authorities to put an end once for all to the practice of Popery in Scotland. All through that summer and during the winter that followed he ventured to remain in seclusion near at hand, keeping watch over the small crop on the land belonging to the seminary. By the next summer he had managed to repair to some extent the damage done, and later on found means to build a new house. This, however, was far inferior to that which had been destroyed, since it occupied the site of the former kitchen only.

In 1749 there were some students in residence again. Yet extreme caution and prudence had to be observed in the manage-

ment of affairs, for persecution had not altogether ceased. In 1756 there were soldiers continually stationed in Glenlivat, with orders to seize any priests, should opportunity offer. Their zeal was stimulated by the promise of liberal rewards.

In 1752 a strict search was made for Father Duthie, but a hint was dropped by a sergeant or his wife, which enabled the priest to escape in time. Not only on that, but on other occasions also, the soldiers were not averse to a bribe to induce them to give timely warning of an impending search. Father Duthie became, in 1758, professor in the Scots College, Paris.

Mr. William Gray was the next superior of Scalan. He was a convert to the faith, and had gained much experience in teaching by acting as tutor in Protestant families of note. After becoming a Catholic he spent a year or two in the Scots College, Paris. Later on he became instructor to the children of Mr. Lundin, of Lundin, who afterwards received from the exiled Stuart sovereign the title of Earl of Perth.

The General Assembly of the Kirk in 1760 deputed two of their number to report upon the state of religion in Glenlivat. The ministers in question accordingly made their appearance on a certain day at the door of the seminary. Mr. Gray, who was expecting a visit from them, went out and courteously invited them to enter. But they would not take the trouble to alight from their horses, and rode off with expressions of surprise that a place of so mean an appearance should have aroused such undeserved interest. Nevertheless, they did not fail to describe Scalan, in the pages of the *Scots Magazine*, as the residence of three priests—a notable inaccuracy, since Mr. Gray was merely a deacon, and there was no other ecclesiastic living in the house at the time. They were probably misled by the exaggerated accounts of neighboring ministers with whom they came in contact. One such authority was bold enough to maintain publicly that there were as many as thirty students in residence, when as a matter of fact their number did not exceed five.

From 1762 to 1767 the seminary was under the direction of a superior destined at a later date to hold high office in the Scottish Church. This was Rev. John Geddes, who became eventually coadjutor to the illustrious Bishop Hay, with the title of Bishop of Morocco. With the advent of a period of comparative peace for Scottish Catholics, it seemed desirable that a superior should be given to Scalan who might be trusted to lift up the little seminary from the state of atrophy resulting from the troublous times of persecution. No more suitable priest could be wished for than Father Geddes. Under his care the house began to flourish exceed-

ingly; studies and discipline acquired new life and temporal affairs improved considerably. Promising students were fitted by careful training for the continental colleges, and the number at Scalan increased to an extent which required extra accommodation. Accordingly a new house was erected in 1767. In that year a new lease was obtained of the little farm. It was granted by a tenant of the Duke of Gordon for another seventeen years. The father of the tenant in question, a farmer named Grant, who had agreed to let the land in the first instance, had constantly turned a deaf ear to the persuasions of the Presbyterian clergy, who would have him drive out the Catholic priest from Scalan. It seemed a manifest reward for his generosity that when he came to die he asked to be received into the Catholic Church, having become convinced of its truth. His son, no less friendly to the Scalan community, often signified his intention of following his father's example; unfortunately, however, death came upon him so suddenly that he could not accomplish his desire.

It was under Father Geddes' rule that the seminary obtained an annual endowment of £12. As this was intended to defray the cost of the education of two boys, it may be easily seen that life at Scalan was the opposite of luxurious. The money was provided partly from a benefaction of Pope Clement XII. towards the education of Scottish students, and partly from certain funds provided by the Stuart Prince styled by Scotsmen James VIII.

In December, 1767, Father Geddes was removed from Scalan to fill an important post on the Scottish mission, the improved state of the seminary justifying the Bishops in entrusting it to a superior of less note. A year or two later he was sent to Spain to settle the delicate question of the removal of the Scots College from Madrid to Valladolid. He was appointed rector of the college when the business was completed, and continued to hold that post until his consecration as Bishop and subsequent return to Scotland.

Trinity Sunday, 1769, which fell upon May 19, was a memorable day, not only for Scalan, but for the whole Church in Scotland. For on that day took place in the little chapel the consecration of George Hay as Bishop of Daulis and coadjutor of the venerable Bishop Grant, who presided at the ceremony. Henceforth the seminary became one of Bishop Hay's prominent interests.

In the years that followed Scalan, under the rule of Rev. John Paterson, succeeded in sending many students to the colleges abroad. In 1774 there were twelve boys in the seminary.

The superior who had succeeded at the death of Father Paterson, Rev. John Farquharson, was transferred in 1784 to the Scots College, Douay, which he presided over until the Revolution of 1793,

when he and his students were compelled to fly for their lives. Returning secretly to Douay, he hoped to save some part of the college property, but without success. His own private effects, even his clothes, had been sold, and the library entirely burned. For a long time his friends in Scotland despaired of his safety, but he at length contrived to reach home towards the end of the year, after encountering numberless hardships and privations. Father Farquharson became a generous benefactor to the Church in Scotland. He founded the Farquharson fund for the aid of necessitous priests, and made considerable donations to Elgin and Strathavon, the latter being near his birthplace. He returned to Paris after the fall of Napoleon to look after the property of the Scottish Church there, and died in that city in 1817.

The buildings at Scalán had long been quite inadequate for the housing of the ever-increasing number of available students. An attempt was made more than once to improve the accommodation, but want of means had always prevented. It is an illustration of the simple manners of those days that in spite of the lack of room the three Bishops of Scotland used it as the place of their annual meeting for several successive years. Bishop Hay had shown a particular affection for the seminary from the first. He loved to retire there from time to time, to spend a period of comparative rest in "Patmos," as he styled its hidden solitude. In 1782 he generously made over to Scalán the sum of £400, part of the compensation money paid for the destruction of his house and chapel in the "No-Popery" riots in Edinburgh, three years previously. Yet still it was found impossible to carry out the necessary enlargement of the buildings. When in 1786 an attempt was made to rebuild the house in part and to roof it with slates, mismanagement of funds on the part of the superior for the time being prevented its completion. It required the constant aid and persistent efforts of the Bishop to keep the work advancing. At length, in the mortal illness of the recently appointed and excellent rector, Rev. Andrew Dawson, Bishop Hay found it necessary to take charge of the seminary in his own person. He curtailed all expenses as far as possible and enforced a rigid economy. To help the slender funds he generously paid a considerable sum for his own board. Meanwhile he pushed on the repairs that had been so long needed.

It was during his residence at Scalán, from 1788 to 1791, and also in the course of his various shorter visits, that the Bishop undertook several missionary journeys in the neighborhood, in order to give Catholics who lived at a distance from any chapel the opportunity of hearing Mass. The picture given by an eye-witness of such expeditions illustrates the poverty and simplicity of the

Bishop's way of living. Mounted on his old gray horse, the saddle laden with a large valise containing Mass vestments and all necessities for the journey, and accompanied by his man, also mounted, the good prelate would arrive on Saturday evening at some farm previously designated, and word having been given beforehand to all Catholics living within easy distance, Mass would be celebrated on Sunday in one of the barns, a blanket serving as a reredos to the hastily constructed altar, and another blanket doing duty as a baldachin. Sometimes he would spend two or three days in one place, hearing confessions, giving advice and even administering medical treatment to those who needed it, his training as a physician in early youth and the varied supply of medicines which always formed part of his outfit, rendering such services appreciable in districts where doctors were few and chemists' shops unknown.

Bishop Hay was compelled to resign the charge of the seminary in 1791 to fill Bishop Geddes' place in Edinburgh while the latter was away in Paris on business connected with the Scottish missions. Although he returned to Scaln for six months in the following year, he found it necessary to relinquish the post of superior to one of his priests.

In 1796 negotiations began with regard to the removal of the seminary to a more favorable site at Aquahorties, in Aberdeenshire. The project was carried out in 1799, and after serving as a seminary for eighty-two years and doing valuable service to the Church in Scotland, Scaln became once more a simple mission, under the charge of a single priest.

The former seminary is now used as a farmhouse. It is a modest building of two stories, about 50 feet long and 16 wide. A square room which takes up the whole of the north end of the house is still called "Bishop Hay's Room." Immediately over it, approached by a steep and narrow wooden staircase, is the small room formerly used as the chapel, where the Blessed Sacrament was reserved. It measures but 16 feet by 10 and is not more than 7 feet high. At one time access was gained to it by Catholics of the neighborhood by a flight of stone steps on the outer wall leading to a door since converted into a window. For it was necessary, in view of a gradually increasing congregation, to adapt the old kitchen which stands on the north side of the dwelling house, at right angles, to serve the purpose of a public chapel. The mark of the altar may still be seen on the wall of the memorable private chapel, the scene of those many hours of day and night devoted by the holy prelate to prayer.

At the opposite end of the house is the room set apart for the students. It was their oratory in the morning, schoolroom during

the day and refectory at meal times. Above it was their dormitory. Life at Scalan was anything but luxurious and would be calculated to affright some of the hardest spirits of our own days. The boys rose at six. There was no lavatory, but, summer and winter alike, they descended to the bank of the Crombie for their morning ablutions in the river. Breakfast and supper consisted of oatmeal porridge. Meat was given at dinner twice or thrice only during the week. On other days vegetables and oatcake and a kind of oatmeal soup, popularly called "sowens," comprised the fare.

A rigorous life, indeed! Yet it raised up a stock of hardy, self-forgetting, energetic clergy, who carried on to a later generation the tradition of a sturdy contempt for softness and delicacy in ecclesiastical training which has made Scottish priests such sturdy laborers in the vineyard of the Lord.

The words of the holy and learned Bishop Geddes, appended to his manuscript history of Scalan Seminary, which has formed the basis of this paper, may fitly serve as an apology for bringing the subject forward in these pages. "The time, by the goodness of God, will come when the Catholic religion will again flourish in Scotland, and then, when posterity will inquire with a laudable curiosity by what means any sparks of the true faith were preserved in these dismal times of darkness and error, Scalan and these other colleges will be mentioned with veneration, and all that can be known concerning them will be received with interest, and even this very account which I give you, however insignificant it may now appear, may one day serve as some monument for our church history, transmitting down to future ages the names of some of those champions who stood up for the cause of God."

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

ON THE REVELATIONS OF ST. BRIDGET.

ONE of the most popular books of devotion in Sweden among Catholics now and among Christians in pre-Reformation days is the "Revelations of St. Bridget of Sweden." In the Middle Ages no spiritual book except "The Following of Christ" had so large a circulation in Scandinavia. It has been translated once or twice into French and partially into German, but never wholly into English; so a summary of its contents may be interesting to English readers.

First of all, it may be as well to say a few words about the

authoress, a canonized saint of the Church, and the circumstances in which the Revelations were written, for they led to the foundation of a large religious order, which in its prime numbered over ninety double monasteries for monks and nuns, whose rule form part of the Revelations.

St. Bridget was a Swedish Princess, the wife of Ulph, Prince of Mercia, by whom she had eight children. She led a most holy mortified life with her husband, wearing a hair shirt under he court dresses, visiting the sick poor, nursing and tending them and often making long and fatiguing pilgrimages. On the death of Ulph in the Cistercian monastery of Alvastra, Bridget, who was living there at the time, began to have her revelations, which, Father Peter, the prior of Alvestra, who was Saint Bridget's confessor and director for many years, and also the companion of her travels after she became a widow, translated into Latin and wrote down. Ulph died in 1344, and two years after the saint, by the command of our Lord, went to Rome, where she made her headquarters for the next twenty-eight years, and eventually died there, on her return from a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, in 1373, in her seventieth year. The following year her remains were translated to Vadstena, in Sweden, the mother house of the Order of St. Saviour, which she founded with the help of her daughter, Catherine the First, Abbess of Vadstena. St. Bridget was canonized in 1391 by Pope Martin V. The Revelations are in nine books, the last of which is called the "Revelationes Extravagantes," and is in some ways the most interesting, as it concerns the rule of St. Saviour. They are called "Extravagantes" merely because they were omitted when Father Peter, the prior of Alvastra, divided the original Celestial Revelations into eight books, and afterwards gave them to the monks at Vadstena, declaring they were divinely revealed to St. Bridget and written down by him from her mouth faithfully.

The edition from which this account is derived was published in Rome in 1606, and was edited and contains notes by Consalvus Durantus, priest and professor of sacred theology, and has a prologue by Matthias, canon of Lincopen, in Sweden, who it is interesting to know glossed the whole Bible excellently and was a very holy man and one of the spiritual advisers of St. Bridget.

The books are subdivided into chapters, which vary in length from a few lines to several pages of folio print, and the whole Revelations make up a large folio volume of nine hundred pages, by which it will be seen they were very lengthy. Each chapter has a titular heading summarizing it. As it would be impossible in the space of an article to deal with the whole of the Revelations, we shall confine ourselves here to the first book and the Extravagantes. The Revela-

tions open in this way: "To the honour of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit and the Mother. Here begins the Book of Celestial Revelations, and of the secrets of God, of sweet love and of wonderful sweetness, to His elect daughter and sweetest spouse."

A great part of the Revelations concern the Passion of our Lord, to which St. Bridget from her early childhood had an intense devotion, and very often they are in the form of a colloquy between Our Lord and Our Lady. Sometimes Our Lady reveals to the saint what her feelings were during the sufferings of her Son, and then they are most touching and beautiful. Very often the chapter begins with a declaration of the greatness and goodness of God, in which the speaker is sometimes one of the Persons in the Holy Trinity, sometimes our Blessed Lady, occasionally one of the saints. The second chapter in Book I. contains a very beautiful simile in the introduction, so we shall quote it:

"The word of Our Lord Jesus Christ to His elect and beloved Spouse." "I am the Creator of heaven and earth, one in Deity with the Father and the Holy Spirit. I am He who spoke by the prophets and patriarchs, and whom they expected. On account of whose desire and according to My promise, I took flesh without sin and concupiscence, going out from the bowels of a Virgin, as a sun shining through a most pure stone. Because as the sun does not hurt the glass in going through it, so neither was the virginity of the Virgin destroyed in taking My humanity."

Chapter IV. teaches how to discern spirits, whether they are good or evil. It also teaches that good people are sometimes mad not from excess of devotion, as the world says, but because of some defect of brain or for some hidden cause, which is for their humiliation.

Chapter VII. contains spiritual advice to the saint from Our Lady, given under the metaphor of clothes, each garment having a mystical meaning: The under garment is contrition, because as it is the nearest to the skin, so contrition and confession are the first way of conversion to God; the tunic is hope in God; the cloak is faith, because the cloak covers all the rest, and all are included in it, so by faith man is able to understand and attain all. The collar is consideration of His Passion, and should be continually fixed in thy breast.

In Chapter VIII. the Queen of Heaven tells her daughter how she ought to praise her Son with His Mother. The ninth chapter tells of Our Lady's immaculate conception and sanctification before her birth; of the joy of St. Anne; of the virtues of the name of Mary, and how the angels rejoice when they hear it and give thanks to God, and how those in Purgatory rejoice as a sick person

lying in bed if he hears any words of comfort, and how the angels draw nearer to the souls they guard when they hear her name, and how the bad angels fear and let go of the souls they hold in their clutches at its sound. Our Lady further tells St. Bridget that as a bird when it has its nails and claws and beak in its prey, if it hears and sound leaves its prey, and when nothing follows, returns to it, so if no amendment follows, the demons return to a soul like a very swift arrow.

In the tenth chapter Our Lady describes the Annunciation and the Passion and Death of her Son. Before the Archangel Gabriel appeared to her she saw a star, but not as if it were shining in the heavens, and a light, but not like a light that lightens the world, and she smelt a most sweet scent almost ineffable, and she exulted for joy and heard a voice, but not from a human mouth, and she was afraid that it might have been an illusion, and immediately there appeared before her the angel of God, like a most beautiful man, but not clothed in flesh, who said, "Ave Maria."

She then tells how she brought forth Our Lord without any fatigue or pain, but with such joy of soul and exultation of body that her feet seemed not to feel the earth on which she stood. When she beheld His beauty her soul distilled as dew for joy, but when she thought of the prophecies concerning His Passion, her eyes filled with tears, and when He saw the tears, He was sad unto death. Then follows a most beautiful description of the Passion, and Our Lady tells how at the first stroke of the scourge she fell down as dead, and when she recovered she saw that He had been beaten till His ribs were visible. Her grief was increased by hearing some bystanders say that He deserved to be crucified, and at the first blow of the hammer she again fell to the ground, and her eyes were obscured and her hands trembling and her feet tottering, and she could not look again for sorrow until He was fixed to the Cross. Then she describes the burial, and adds that that good John took her home.

In Chapter XVIII. are instructions from Our Lord about the building of the first Brigittine monastery. "In My house should be humility, and a wall dividing the men and women, and a wall between the two habitations, which must be strong and not very high. The windows are to be simple and transparent, the roof moderately high, and nothing is to appear there save what is redolent of humility; the roof by being moderately high signifies that My Wisdom can only be partly understood, never fully. The four walls are My justice, My wisdom, My power and My mercy. I am the foundation."

The Revelations abound in this kind of mystical interpretation of

external things. Chapter XX. is a colloquy between Christ and the Blessed Virgin, in which Our Lord instructs His spouse, St. Bridget, in what way to prepare for her nuptials, and tells her He desires her to have many spiritual children. He mentions St. John the Evangelist as "My dearest John," and says he was like a reed full of sweetness and honey, and so pure that he merited to be called Angel and Virgin.

The next chapter is very mystical and quaint, and tells of a certain magician possessing some splendid gold which a simple workman came to buy, and when he had bought it, the magician told him it was not gold, but a vile frog which he had nourished in his bosom. The interpretation of this is that the magician was the devil and the frog the soul of man, jumping through pride.

The heading to Chapter XXII. is: "A Most Sweet Question of the B. V. M. to St. Bridget and the Humble Answer of the Spouse." The question was: "Tell me what is in thy soul and what thou seekest?" and the spouse answers that she fears two things—the first, sins which she has not wept for nor amended, and the second, because the enemies of Christ are many. Our Lady comforts her and tells her among other things that the evils are permitted to live for the trial of the good, which is further explained under the metaphor of a rose growing among thorns.

Chapter XXIII. describes the enemies of God under the figure of a most repulsive image of a man, every part of him symbolizing sin or folly—*e. g.*, his heart is a scorpion, because it is full of injustice and deceit; his arms are malice, because of his malice. An odd metaphor occurs at the end of the next chapter: As it is said that if oil in which there is a dead scorpion is poured onto any one bitten by a scorpion he is healed, so when a wicked man, seeing another sinner, is filled with compunction, he is healed.

Chapter XXVI. opens with some beautiful words of praise from the army of angels and treats of matrimony and then of spiritual nuptials, the gist of the whole of it being that God is always *third* with those husbands and wives who live chastely. Chapter XXVIII. describes the terrible judgment passed by God on a certain man, declared in a note to be a canon of noble birth, and a sub-deacon who obtained a false dispensation to marry a rich virgin and was prevented by sudden death from obtaining his desire.

In the next chapter Our Lady tells the spouse of two ladies, one of whom is Pride and the other Humility, that is, herself. She is most humble, yet sits in a spacious seat, and over her is neither sun, nor moon, nor stars, nor clouds, but a wonderful serene, clear light proceeding from the excellent beauty of the Divine Majesty. Below her is neither earth nor stones, but an incomparable rest in the power

of God. There are no walls round her, but an army of angels and holy souls, and yet though enthroned so high, she hears the sobs and sighs and prayers of her friends.

Chapter XXXI. describes a vision St. Bridget had of the B. V. M. having a precious crown on her head and her hair spread over her shoulders of indescribable beauty. She wore a golden tunic shining with wonderful splendor and a blue mantle the color of the sky. When St. Bridget saw this beautiful vision she stood as if in ecstasy. Blessed John the Baptist then appeared and explained what this lovely vision meant, for it had a mystical meaning. The crown denoted a Queen, the hair extended the most pure and Immaculate Virgin, the mantle was blue because she was dead to all temporal things, the tunic was golden because she was burning with divine charity, and so forth.

In Chapter XXXV. the B. V. M. explains how her heart suffered in the Passion, so that as Adam and Eve sold the world for one apple, so her Son and she redeemed the world as it were with one heart.

The next most striking chapter is LI., wherein Christ compares Our Lady to a flower born in a valley, all the leaves of which have a mystical meaning denoting some virtue. The same simile is continued in the next chapter, and St. Bridget is told to transmit Christ's words to the Pope and other prelates of the Church, and to tell Father Matthias to explain these words diligently.

In Chapter LVII. Our Lord tells His spouse that He is like unpalatable food to some Christian souls, to whom the world is pleasing, and how He will come as a giant to such, strong, terrible and severe, and they shall flee as a gnat before Him.

In the last chapter of Book I. Our Lord tells His spouse of three kinds of Christians, typified by the Jews in Egypt: "1, those who believed in God and Moses; 2, those who believed in God and doubted Moses, and 3, those who doubted both. By Moses is meant the word of God.

The above is a brief summary of the more salient features of the first book of the Celestial Revelations, sufficient to give an idea of the character of the work, against which in 1433 a storm of criticism arose, as it did also against the whole order, and the prior of Vadstena was summoned to the General Council then assembled at Basle to answer the accusations of heresy brought against the saint. No less than two hundred points were called in question, in all of which St. Bridget was said to have erred by her accusers. A committee was appointed to examine Father Gervinus and the Revelations, the soul of which was John de Torquemado, afterwards made a Cardinal. He most zealously defended St. Bridget and main-

tained the higher inspiration of the Revelations, and pointed out that the way in which they harmonized with the prophets and Holy Scripture was in itself a proof of their truth. His decision made a great impression, and to him St. Bridget owed the victory she gained, both for the Revelations and her double monasteries, the wisdom of which had also been called in question. They are not, of course, of faith, but they were declared free from error.

The "Revelationes Extravagantes" are less spiritual and contain amplifications of the rule of St. Saviour, as the rule of the Brigittines is called, and also many little anecdotes of St. Catherine. They also show how St. Bridget consulted Our Lord in prayer about everything. This book is also divided into chapters, the first of which deals with a question which had been disturbing the prior, Father Peter, as to whether extra clothing and bedding should be allowed to the sick members of the order, to which Our Lord replied that all necessary things and nothing superfluous should be granted them.

The following chapters concern the singing of the nuns, whose office is to follow that of the monks and to be rather more severe. They are to imitate the singing of the Carthusians and be grave, uniform and, above all, humble, and savor more of sweetness and devotion than of ostentation. In the eighth chapter Our Lord tells St. Bridget to go to Rome and remain there fifteen years in great tribulations until she has seen the Pope and the Emperor. So she went when she was forty-two, and remained for fifteen years before Urban V. and the Emperor Charles came.

While in Rome she had many revelations concerning the state of the city and the sins of the people, which so roused the hatred of the Romans against her that they threatened to burn her alive.

One chapter directs that no organs are to be used in Brigittine monasteries, although the Israelites of old kindled their devotion with organs and trumpets.

In Chapter XII. the saint is shown that humility and discretion are more pleasing to Our Lord than indiscreet fasting. Vegetables are permitted to those fasting on bread and water, and the water may be boiled, for bread is dry and hard without vegetables and water unless cooked is like tisan. It is healthy to fast at the stated times, but the abbess and the confessor are to have compassion and dispense the sick and those who are tired with work. Baths are allowed to the members of the order once a month or once a fortnight if asked for, and for the sick as often as required.

In Chapter XIX. St. Bridget complains to Our Lady that many women are easily found as subjects to her order, but few men will devote themselves to providing for the spiritual needs of women,

which was the chief work of the Brigittine monks. Our Lady told her that she was not be anxious, as Our Lord knew whom He had ordained to the order. No one may be chosen as abbess who is illegitimate, no matter how holy she may be. An unmarried woman is to be chosen preferably as abbess, but if there is none suitable in the community, then a widow, but she must be humble, for better a humble widow than a proud virgin. The fathers are to preach simple sermons according to the capacity of the audience, remembering that Our Lord's dearest Mother was most simple, Peter illiterate and Francis a peasant; nevertheless, because they had perfect charity, they were more successful preachers than masters of eloquence. All the following chapters up to Chapter XLIV. are concerned with details of the rule and directions for the building of the monasteries of the order.

In Chapter XLIV. Christ tells St. Bridget to tell Father Peter, of Alvastra, to write the rule of St. Saviour at her dictation, and neither to add nor to take away anything from her words. An account of how she began to have the revelations is given a little further on. Some years after the death of her husband, when the saint was anxious about her state of life, the spirit of the Lord was poured round her, inflaming her, and she was rapt in an ecstasy and saw in spirit a bright cloud and heard a voice from the cloud saying to her: "I am thy God, who wish to speak to thee." Fearful lest it might be an illusion of the devil, she heard the voice say: "Do not fear, for I am the Maker of all things and no deceiver. Know that I do not speak on account of thee only, but on account of the salvation of all Christians. Hear what I say. Thou shalt be My spouse, and thou shalt see spiritual things and secret celestial things, and My spirit shall remain with thee until death. Believe, therefore, that I am with thee."

In Chapter XLVIII. we read that as Bridget was praying Christ appeared to her, saying: "Tell Brother Peter, the sub-prior, from Me that I have many sons Christians who are held in snares by the devil. Out of charity I send to them the words of My mouth, which I speak through a woman. Brother Peter, hear her and write in Latin the words which she shall say to thee from Me."

St. Bridget communicated this revelation to Brother Peter immediately, but he, wishing to deliberate over it, stood one evening in the church beating his brains about it. At last from humility he decided not to undertake the task, reputing himself unworthy and doubting lest it were an illusion of the devil. Then suddenly he was struck as if with a blow, and immediately felt as if dead, deprived of his senses and bodily powers, but nevertheless his intellect remained clear:

The monks, finding him thus lying on the ground, carried him to his cell and placed him in bed, and thus he lay for the great part of the night, as if half dead. Then by a divine inspiration the thought came to him that perhaps he suffered thus because he was unwilling to obey the precept and revelation made to him through St. Bridget. He said in his heart: "O Lord God, if it is on this account, spare me and I am willing to obey and write all she shall tell me." And immediately he was cured, and he went quickly to St. Bridget and offered to write all the revelations. And for thirty years Father Peter, who was afterwards prior of Alvastra, was the saint's confessor and companion and follower in all her travels and wrote all the revelations and divine visions she had up to the time of her death. Before Father Peter's death Our Lord commanded that afterwards the revelations should be given to Father Alphonsus, a Spanish hermit, formerly Bishop of Jaen.

In Chapter LV. a description is given of a certain holy monk of Alvastra named Gerechinus, who was of great sanctity and passed his days and nights in prayer and was favored with visions, in one of which he saw Our Lord at the Elevation in the species of a boy. When St. Bridget first went to reside in his monastery he was rather scandalized and wondered why she did so, for it was against their rule and a new custom for women to live in the monastery, but it was revealed to him in prayer that she was a friend of God, upon which he went and told his prior with tears of his rash judgment. This Brother, we are told, once saw St. Bridget elevated in the air and flames coming from her mouth and heard a voice saying she was a woman bringing wisdom to all nations.

A pretty legend is then narrated of this monk. He was once told by his abbot to go and help in the bakehouse, but he not being accustomed to the duties of the bakehouse, spoke to a picture of Our Lady on the wall, which he was accustomed to venerate, and said: "Dearest Lady, the abbot commands me to labor with the bakers. Thou knowest that I know nothing of baking; nevertheless, I will do thy will." To which the image answered: "Do what you have hitherto done; I will serve for thee in the bakehouse." And so it was done, and those in the bakehouse knew not who was working with them, but thought it was Brother Gerechinus, who remained fixed in prayer in the church.

In Chapter LVI. Ulph Gudmarson, the saint's husband, appeared to her and told her the causes of his Purgatorial pains and the remedies necessary for his speedy deliverance. There were five reasons for his Purgatory: He had doted on one of his sons, spoiling him; he had neglected to make sufficient provision for his family before his death; he had been pertinacious in the exile of a certain

noble, who nevertheless had deserved punishment; that he had injudiciously helped a certain unworthy man in his money difficulties, and that he had taken part in fencing and other worldly amusements more from vanity than necessity. Then he asks her for Masses for a whole year, and tells her to take care of the poor, and especially to give away things that he loved too much, as his horses, and she is to offer some of his cups for chalices, but to leave his immovable things for his sons.

In Chapter LVIII. Our Lady tells St. Bridget that fasting is to be done with discretion, as it is more acceptable to her Son to eat than to fast against obedience. It is wrong to fast vainly to be seen, or foolishly like those who fast in illness, or irrationally, that is, more than others, to obtain a greater reward. Later on in this book a story à propos to fasting is told which we will relate here. When Bridget was traveling from Rome on a pilgrimage to the sepulchre of St. Andrew, in Italy, she was obliged by illness to stop at a place called Bari, and when Advent arrived they could not get any fish, and there were many infirm persons with her, so she asked Our Lord to have compassion upon them, that they might not scandalize their neighbors by eating meat in fasting time, and that the weak might not faint by fasting. Our Lord appeared to her and said: "Fish is very cold, and the weather is not very warm; the way is stony and difficult, and you are infirm, so eat what you can find. I am above all your vows."

Several appearances are described in the "*Revelationes Extravagantes*" of the saints besides Our Lord and Our Lady. St. John the Baptist, St. Botvidus of Sweden and St. Dionysius all appeared to her. In some of the revelations advice is given to the King and Bishops of Sweden and to the Swedish Princes. Chapter XCVI. narrates how on a certain day, after Bridget had written a rule for herself and copied it into a book called "*A Mirror for Virgins*," she was rapt in spirit, and when she recovered she heard a voice saying that virginity merits a crown, widowhood draws near to God, marriage does not shut out from heaven, but obedience introduces all to glory.

Chapter CIII. gives us a peep into the temporal trials of the saint. When she was staying in Rome it happened before All Saints' Day that she was in great need of money, for she had received many loans, and it was three years since any money had reached her from her own country, and her creditors came daily and begged that she would return the money lent by them. Then Our Lord appeared to her and told her to accept the money lent her boldly and promise to pay her creditors on the first Sunday after the octave of the Epiphany. She did so, and about Vespers on that Sunday a mes-

senger came from Sweden carrying the money and she made satisfaction to her creditors on the same day. In the last chapter Our Lady tells St. Bridget that although Father Peter, who translated the revelations, did not write classical Latin, still his words were more pleasing to her than the Latin of worldly men, and further commanded that all the revelations were to be kept at Alvastra until her monastery at Vadstena was finished.

The above extracts will perhaps suffice to give an idea of the scope of the revelations to those who have not the opportunity of seeing the original. Besides the partial translations of the revelations mentioned in the beginning of this article, there have been no less than twenty-two Latin versions published. The first was published at Lubeck in 1492. The one consulted by the present writer was published in 1606 in Rome, and contains the prologue written by Father Matthias, one of St. Bridget's directors, the holy canon of Linköping, and has notes by Consalvus Duran, a priest. A partial English translation was published in New York in 1873.

A most interesting passage occurs in the "*Revelationes Extravagantes*" which we must not omit to note, as it is believed to be the first mention of Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament which occurs in history. Here Our Lord tells St. Bridget that the Sacrament of His Body should be placed over His altar continually in a decent sapphire or crystal vase, that Him whom daily they behold under another form they may desire more fervently. He also ordered, as is recorded in the same chapter, that when a nun was too ill to receive the Blessed Sacrament, the abbess, if at night, or the priest might carry the monstrance with the Host to the sick nun, the convent following, and show it to her, saying: "May thy faith profit thee to eternal life and salvation." This was done in the case of the first abbess, St. Bridget's own daughter, Catherine, who was too ill to receive Communion when on her deathbed.

A great part of the revelations is concerned with denouncing the worldliness and wickedness of the reigning sovereigns of Sweden, Naples and other places and in threatening them with the judgments of God if they did not repent. The clergy also are severely reproved for their laxity and falling away from grace, and there is a great deal of repetition in the course of the nine books, also a great deal that is very mystical and difficult of comprehension. In the above extracts we have endeavored to take out the pearls from the oysters.

DARLEY DALE.

PIUS VII. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.—V.

THE religious treaty known as the Concordat, which had been negotiated between the Holy See and the French Republic, put an end to the persecution to which, during ten years, the Catholic Church had been subjected by the various governments which had succeeded each other in France. It also marked the beginning of new relations between the Church and the State very different from those which existed under the monarchy, when the possessions of the clergy rendered them, to a certain degree, independent of the royal authority. As a first act of hostility to the Church the *Assemblée Constituante* had seized all ecclesiastical property; by the *Constitution Civile* it had placed the nomination of the Bishops in the hands of the people and founded a schismatical church. The Convention treated the priest as an outlaw and an enemy of the State, to be hunted down and exterminated without mercy. The Directory, less sanguinary in its methods, though equally hostile, had sent him to perish in the swamps of Guyana or on board the hulks; but the Church had survived every form of persecution, and the mass of the French people had remained firmly attached to their faith. Bonaparte saw that to restore peace to the Church and to France it would be necessary to check the anti-Christian fanaticism of the Jacobin party, and to put an end to the schism. But he did not intend to restore to the Church the influence it had possessed in the days of the monarchy. Guided in all his actions by political motives, he wished the clergy to be merely the salaried servants of the State, charged with the maintenance of order and the repression of opinions hostile to the government, and liable to be fined or imprisoned for any manifestation of independence. And yet, so intolerable had been the situation of the Church in France, that this small amount of liberty, hampered on all sides by jealous regulations, some of them reluctantly accepted by the Holy See and others arbitrarily imposed, was hailed as "a triumph of Christianity and a signal victory for the Papacy."

The successful conclusion of the Concordat in spite of the ill-will of the army and the opposition of nearly all the members of his government, seems to have convinced Bonaparte that his rule was so popular and so firmly established that he might venture to make a further advance towards the throne. Without openly demanding a prolongation of his dignity as First Consul or its conversion into an hereditary monarchy, he allowed his friends and partisans to proclaim that it was the duty of the nation to present a testimonial of its gratitude to the man who had given peace to the Church,

restored order in France and reconciled the Revolution with Europe.¹ This reward could only take the form of an augmentation of power, and it was well known that that was the object of Bonaparte's ambition, though he carefully avoided giving any intimation of his wishes. The question was submitted to the Senate, many of the members of which were willing to confer upon the General the Consulate for life, but the Republican party, led by Sieyès, spread the belief that all that he desired was a term of ten years, and on May 8, 1802, a vote was passed to that effect. This decision, which was far inferior to what Bonaparte expected, caused him intense displeasure, and he was at first inclined to reject the offer. The difficulty was solved by the skillful management of Cambacérès, who suggested that the Council of State should invite the people to vote upon the question, "Shall Napoleon Bonaparte be Consul for life?" The answer was given in the affirmative by an enormous majority, and on August 3, 1802, it was ratified by a decree of the Senate and presented to the First Consul.

Though Bonaparte was resolved to keep the Church subjected to the government as much as possible, he seemed anxious at first to entertain the most cordial relations with the Holy See and with the clergy. He presented to Pius VII. two armed brigs, the St. Peter and the St. Paul, for the defense of his States against the Barbary corsairs, and he ordered a monument to be erected in the Cathedral of Valence to the memory of Pius VI. The Sisters of Charity were now authorized to wear their costume in public as of old; other religious associations for the relief of the infirm had also since some time been allowed to reopen their convents and resume their work in the hospitals. But even while making these demonstrations of good-will towards the Church he showed that he was resolved to interfere in its discipline and regulate it in accordance with the interests of his policy.

By his favorite device of threatening to break off all relations with Rome unless his demands were complied with, the First Consul had obliged Cardinal Caprara to accept twelve of the schismatical Bishops, in spite of the very doubtful assurances which they had given of their repentance. He was now determined to compel him, by a similar combination of trickery and menaces, to readmit into the Church on still easier terms the priests who had taken the oath to the *Constitution Civile du Clergé*. Cardinal Caprara had given to all the newly nominated Bishops a form of abjuration to be signed by these priests, in which they declared that they gave up the benefices which they had occupied without having been canonically

¹ L. A. Thiers, "History of the Consulate and the Empire," 1893, Vol. II., pp. 281-283.

instituted; that they submitted entirely to the judgments pronounced by the Holy See on the ecclesiastical affairs of France, and that they professed true and sincere obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff and to their lawful Bishop. After they had signed this document the Bishops were to give them the decree of absolution and the dispensation from irregularity.²

But this form of retractation seemed to the government to inflict too much humiliation on the clergy of the Constitutional Church. It involved, moreover, the condemnation of the *Assemblée Constituante* which had founded that Church at the dawn of the Revolution, and whose acts the First Consul insisted on respecting as the expression of the will of the nation. It was different also from the letter prepared by Bernier and Portalis, in which the schismatical Bishops declared that they submitted to the Holy Father, and which, though departing from the form prescribed in Rome, had been accepted by Cardinal Caprara on the understanding that they should compensate for the insufficiency of its expressions by a verbal acceptance of the conditions specified in the decree of absolution.³ On May 27, 1802, Portalis sent one of his subordinates to inform Cardinal Caprara that many Bishops were in a state of consternation, as they did not know how they should be able to receive the schismatical clergy back into the Church. He requested, therefore, that the matter should be left to the judgment of each Bishop. This the Legate refused to do, and said that those Bishops who professed to be embarrassed should come to see him, and that he would certainly be able to come to an understanding with them, but that any further concession was beyond his powers.⁴

Portalis seems to have been satisfied with this reply, but the First Consul on receiving his Minister's report insisted on the exclusive employment of the formula approved of by the government, and by means of the usual description of the dangers about to overwhelm the Church the unfortunate Cardinal was at last compelled to yield. The Legate was summoned on June 7 to an interview with Bonaparte at La Malmaison, and though so broken down in health that he was hardly able to take part in a discussion, he instantly obeyed. Bonaparte told him that all that was required for the reconciliation of the schismatical priests was that they should renounce the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and promise to obey their lawful Bishops. Anything more than that was, he said, useless, superfluous and an act of pride on the part of Rome, while the difficulties alleged by

² P. Ilario Rinieri, S. J., "La Diplomazia Pontificia nel Secolo XIX.," Roma, 1902, Vol. II., p. 22.

³ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, I., p. 470; II., 250.

⁴ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, II., p. 22, p. 246, Caprara à Consalvi, 30 Mai, 1802.

the Cardinal were a cause of mortal anguish to the people and to the more pusillanimous among the Bishops, and many thousands of Catholics were asking to become Protestants. The discussion, in which Portalis and Mgr. Sala, one of the Cardinal's secretaries, also took part, lasted for two hours, but no concession was made on either side. At last Bonaparte lost patience and said that if what he considered to be indispensable, necessary and advantageous for the good of religion and of the French people were done, it would be useless for the Cardinal to remain in France. There were still eleven Bishops to be nominated, and in consequence of these theological subtleties of Rome, they should all be chosen from among the Constitutional clergy.⁵

As the Cardinal had successfully resisted this onslaught other tactics were tried. Mgr. Pancemont, Bishop of Vannes, brought to him on the following morning a letter from Portalis, in which the Minister reminded him that the circulation in France of the formula of retractation for the clergy which he had given to the French Bishops, as well as of the decree by which the extraordinary faculties which had been granted to them by Pius VI. in 1792 were prolonged for six months, constituted an infraction of the conditions under which he had been received in France. He had solemnly sworn to observe these conditions, and according to them he could not cause any document to circulate in France without the authorization of the government. He was therefore requested to withdraw this formula as well as the decree, as otherwise the Bishops and other ecclesiastics who accepted it should be treated as State criminals, and he would bear the terrible responsibility of the misfortunes which should be the result. In addition to these threats Mgr. Pancemont presented to him an alarming picture of the extreme irritation of the First Consul, to whom no one dared to suggest any change in his decisions, and of the dangers to which the Bishops would be exposed from the hostility of the government. The Cardinal replied immediately to Portalis that in order not to offend the government he would at once withdraw both the formula of retractation and the decree.

As the Cardinal had thus been forced to withdraw the formula which was displeasing to Bonaparte, he had now to be obliged to publish one which should be in conformity with the First Consul's opinions. No time was lost, for on the evening of the 8th Talleyrand himself appeared on the scene, and in a sad tone of voice told the Legate that all the labor that had been bestowed on the reëstablishment of religion was on the point of being thrown away. Neither the First Consul nor any other member of the government would

⁵ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, II., p. 26, Caprara & Consalvi, 13 Jun., 1802.

allow the Legate to demand from the Constitutional priests what he had demanded. If the Bishops attempted to do so, misfortunes without end would be the result. The people have been stirred up. The Catholics were revolted by the harshness with which Rome was treating the clergy, and they were thinking of embracing Protestantism. In a word, everything was on the point of utter ruin, and Rome and the Legate would be guilty of destroying religion by not condescending to show a more conciliatory spirit in such a lamentable state of affairs. Talleyrand's threats produced no effect on Cardinal Caprara, and on the following morning he also refused to yield to the urgent appeal of Mgr. Champion de Cicé, Archbishop of Aix, who repeated the same arguments. The Archbishop, however, was closely followed by the Bishop of Vannes, who told the Legate that on his decision depended either the existence or the total ruin of the Catholic religion in France and in the neighboring countries, and gave him a letter from Portalis. The Minister stated that the only declaration which the government would allow to be demanded from the Constitutional priests was: "I adhere to the Concordat, and I am in communion with my Bishop, who has been nominated by the First Consul and instituted by the Pope." Portalis added that it was evident that this declaration was sufficient; that the past ought to be forgotten; that the French character would not tolerate any irritating or humiliating expression, and that the interests of the Church, of the Holy See and of France demanded the cessation of controversies which could bring no remedy for the past, but would disturb the present and destroy everything in the future.

Cardinal Caprara, who appears to have been unaware of the real state of affairs in France, was terrified by the heavy responsibility thus cast upon him, and he gave way before this combination of threats and falsehoods which Bonaparte and his Ministers had so often employed with success. As he stated in his report to Cardinal Consalvi, he reflected that when it is a question of reconciling to the Church a large number of persons such rigorous conditions cannot be exacted as in the case of a few. On his decision, moreover, would depend the preservation or the total ruin of the Church, and he came, therefore, to the conclusion that he would not struggle against the declared will of the government, but would accept the formulat proposed by Portalis. The three theologians attached to the Legation did not, it is true, share his opinion or approve of his action, but he wrote at once to the Minister that he would accept the formula proposed by the government. To the Bishops he announced that the Constitutional priests wishing to be reconciled to the Church might present that declaration, but he added that when they had signed it the Bishops should warn them to put their conscience in

order ("*de pourvoir à leur conscience*"). Portalis on his side consented to allow the Cardinal's decree of May 8, which prolonged the faculties granted by Pius VI. to stand, for the cleverly contrived plot had succeeded; Bonaparte and Talleyrand had obtained what they wanted; the schismatical priests were enabled to reënter the Church and hold ecclesiastical dignities without having been compelled to make a formal recantation of their errors.⁶

It is needless to add that Cardinal Caprara's concession, extorted from him by this disgraceful intrigue, caused the Holy Father intense grief. The theologians and the Cardinals whom he consulted on the subject declared that the formula dictated by the government for the reconciliation of the Constitutional clergy was insufficient. They suggested that a brief should be sent to Bonaparte to protest against the action of his government and another to the Legate to signify disapprobation of his conduct, but no steps would seem to have been taken to carry out these recommendations.⁷

As a further proof of the partiality of the First Consul for the Constitutional clergy, Portalis wrote on June 8 to all the Bishops who had not been members of the Constitutional Church that they should select one of their "*Grands Vicaires*" from among the Constitutional clergy, as well as a third of their canons and parish priests. If they were unable to observe this proportion, they should refer the matter to the First Consul and justify the exceptions they had made to this rule. Those Bishops who had belonged to the Constitutional Church were bound, on the other hand, to choose as "*Grand Vicaire*" priests who had not belonged to that schism.⁸ But this was not the only act of interference in the administration of the French Church on the part of the First Consul, who thus began that series of aggressions on the liberty of the Church which in the days of the empire filled the prisons and fortresses of France with nearly

⁶ Both Bonaparte and Talleyrand must have been well aware of the falsity of these statements with regard to the irritation of the people against Rome. They cannot have forgotten the reports furnished by the Commission of 1801 on the State of France (see the number of the *Review* for October, 1908, especially the report of Barbé Marbois, p. 583), according to which the great majority of the people throughout France were intensely hostile to the schismatic priests and steadily rejected their ministrations. Portalis also, in his report of February 25, 1802, to the First Consul (Boulay de la Meurthe, *Documents sur la négociation du Concordat*, t. V., p. 163), quotes the testimony of the prefects of several departments with regard to this general aversion for the Constitutional clergy, an aversion which the conduct of many of its members had much contributed to strengthen.

⁷ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, II, p. 54.

⁸ Count Joseph Jauffret, "*Mémoires historiques sur les Affaires Ecclésiastiques de France pendant les premières années du xix. siècle*," Paris, 1823, t. I., p. 64. According to Article 21 of the "*Articles Organiques*," each Bishop might name two vicars general and each Archbishop three. (Migne, "*Encyclopédie théologique*," t. XXXVIII., p. 1,019.)

as many confessors of the faith as the anti-Christian government of the Directory.

Bonaparte had ordered the prefects of the Republic to exercise a strict censorship over all publications which appeared in their respective departments, and this supervision extended even to the pastorals of the Bishops. He was thus enabled to prevent the expression of hostile criticisms directed against his government, and to make use of the influence of the Church for the furtherance of his own interests. As there were cases where a diocese comprised two departments, the prefects of which held diametrically opposite views on religious questions, and therefore judged a pastoral according to their conflicting opinions, the position of many Bishops became so intolerable that at last Portalis intervened and obtained that this censorship should be transferred from the prefects to his office in Paris. But though every allusion to political questions could be thus suppressed, the same office frequently requested the Bishops to direct their parish priests to use all their influence to inculcate submission to the law of conscription, and to remind their flocks that one of the first duties of a citizen and a Christian was the defense of his country.⁹

Since some years a reaction against the excesses of the Revolution and a tendency towards monarchical institutions had been gradually spreading through France. Those to whom the Revolution had brought wealth, political influence or military rank dreaded the downfall of the firm government of the First Consul, on whom depended the safety of their possessions. The Royalist conspiracies against Bonaparte, so actively carried on at this time, strengthened this conviction, and though the execution of the Duc d'Enghien, falsely accused of having shared in these plots, spread for a time a feeling of horror and consternation even among the partisans of Bonaparte, the impression remained that it was necessary, by raising the First Consul to the throne and creating an hereditary monarchy, to frustrate the aims of his enemies, and thus put an end to their plots. The ultimate object of Bonaparte's ambition was well known to all those in his immediate vicinity, though he carefully avoided giving any expression of his intentions. It was Fouché, the ex-Oratorian and ex-Jacobin, his former Minister of Police, who undertook to divine his hidden wishes and to carry out, along with some of the leaders of the Senate, the intrigues required to give them effect. Addresses and petitions, covered with signatures from the camps in several parts of France, from the municipal councils of the great towns and from electoral colleges then in session, were presented to

⁹ Count d'Haussonville, "*L'Eglise Romaine et le premier Empire*," Paris, 1868, t. I., pp. 275-277.

Bonaparte demanding the establishment of a new form of government which should consolidate all power in his hands and secure its perpetuation in his family. The First Consul then, abandoning his reserve, consulted his colleagues on the subject. The Third Consul, Lebrun, immediately acquiesced, but as Cambacérès strongly objected, alleging the danger of a war with the older monarchies, which might withhold their recognition, Bonaparte resolved not to interfere, but to let public opinion take its course.

An address from the Senate on March 29, 1804, on a question relating to foreign affairs gave Fouché and his friends an opportunity for at last making a formal demand for the reestablishment of monarchy, in order to deprive conspirators of the temptation to destroy everything by a single blow. Bonaparte thanked the Senate, but deferred giving a definite reply to their suggestion until he had acquired the certainty that the army would support him and that the principal sovereigns of Europe would not refuse to recognize him. Austria and Prussia were the powers consulted, and they immediately acquiesced, while the army gave him the strongest proofs of devotion, and on April 25 Bonaparte asked the Senate to give further explanations of its views and its wishes—a very evident request for a definite offer of the throne. As no public discussions took place in the Senate, it was decided to treat the question in the Tribune, the only body where there was still some freedom of speech, and one of its members, Jean François Curée, who had once been an ardent Republican, was chosen to open the debate and propose the reestablishment of an hereditary monarchy in favor of the family of Bonaparte. The motion was brought forward on April 30. It met with almost unanimous support, and on May 4 the vote of the Tribune that the First Consul, Napoleon Bonaparte, should be named Emperor, and that the title and the authority should be made hereditary in his family, was laid before the Senate, which approved of it. On the same day it presented to the First Consul a memorial, in which it expressed its views with regard to the new organization of France. A committee was then formed consisting of the three Consuls, the Ministers and several Senators, to draw up a Constitution for the empire and name the chief dignitaries, whose functions and titles are believed to be mostly the invention of Talleyrand, and on May 18, 1804, the *Senatus Consultum*, which declared Napoleon Bonaparte Emperor of the French, was presented to him at St. Cloud.¹⁰

In the preceding year Bonaparte had sent his uncle, Cardinal

¹⁰ Thiers, *op. cit.*, III., pp. 202, 218. The decision of the Senate was then submitted to a popular vote. It was ratified by a large majority and published on the eve of the coronation.

Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons, to represent the French Republic in Rome in place of M. Cacault. The latter, a *Breton*, who spoke of himself as "a converted revolutionist, *un révolutionnaire corrigé*," by his prudence, his tact and his conciliatory spirit, had much contributed to restore a good understanding between the Holy See and France. He had acquired the friendship and the confidence of Pius VII. and of Cardinal Consalvi, but his frank and sturdy character would not have allowed him to assist the ambitious plans which Bonaparte was already preparing to carry out, and in spite of the entreaties of Cardinal Consalvi he was recalled. His successor, Cardinal Fesch (1763-1839) had been canon and archdeacon of Ajaccio before the Revolution. Driven from Corsica, together with the other members of the Bonaparte family, by the civil war between the partisans of England and those of France, he was obliged to lay aside his ecclesiastical costume and position and obtain employment in the commissariat. Later on he became *commissaire des guerres*, or commissary general, at the headquarters of the army of Italy commanded by his nephew. When, by the overthrow of the Directory, Bonaparte became First Consul, Fesch retired from the world. At the restoration of the hierarchy by the Concordat he was nominated Archbishop of Lyons, and shortly afterwards was promoted to the dignity of Cardinal. Bonaparte had long been fascinated by the idea of having himself crowned in Paris by the Pope as successor of Charlemagne, whose empire over a large part of Europe he aimed at restoring, and to attain this end he required to have in Rome a representative more docile and more blindly obedient to his orders than M. Cacault. The new Minister, unaccustomed to the usages of diplomacy, was far from entertaining the same friendly relations with the Papal Court, with the other members of the diplomatic body and with Roman society as his predecessor. There is even reason to believe that the haughty and dictatorial attitude adopted by the Cardinal was the result of Bonaparte's orders, who thought that he might render the Holy Father subservient to his views by inspiring him with a dread of his power.¹¹

Though the *Senatus Consultum* by which the First Consul was proclaimed Emperor of the French had not yet been published, the vote of May 4 was sufficiently decisive to enable Bonaparte to announce officially to Cardinal Caprara on the evening of May 9 his resolution of having himself crowned in Paris by the Sovereign Pontiff. But by a strange coincidence Cardinal Caprara had that very day written to Rome to express his belief that such would be the case, and his hope that the request would be granted without hesitation. A refusal would be extremely disagreeable to the Em-

¹¹ D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, I., 304, 305.

peror, while great advantages to the Holy See, both from the spiritual and the temporal point of view, would be the result of the Pope's journey to Paris. The Emperor-elect, it is true, did not that evening make a formal demand with regard to the matter, but merely requested the Legate to ascertain as a preliminary step what might be the opinion of the Holy Father on the subject. The request caused much surprise and uneasiness in Rome, as the Pope and the members of the Sacred College could not forget the spoliation of the Church of which General Bonaparte had been directly or indirectly the cause, and they felt but small confidence in whatever promises he might make. Cardinal Consalvi cautiously replied on May 23 that the Holy Father would hasten to congratulate the Emperor as soon as all the formalities of his election should have been accomplished. A few days later he pointed out to the Legate that in eighteen centuries there had been no example of a Pope undertaking such a long journey for a purely secular object, and that only very important religious motives could justify a Sovereign Pontiff in abandoning his residence and thereby suspending for a time the discussion of the many ecclesiastical questions which are continually being referred to Rome.

The matter was submitted to a congregation of twenty Cardinals, on whose discussions was imposed the secrecy of the confessional, and their answers are not to be found in the archives of the Vatican; but a despatch of Cardinal Consalvi to the Legate gives an abstract of the various objections made to the journey of the Holy Father.¹² A favorable answer was, however, about to be returned to the Emperor's request when the *Senatus Consultum* of May 18 was received in Rome. Among other things it enacted that the Emperor was to swear to uphold the laws of the Concordat and the liberty of worship, "*la liberté des cultes.*" But the laws of the Concordat might be considered as comprising also the *Articles Organiques*, which had been published along with them without the consent of the Holy Father, and had been formally rejected by him as being opposed to the laws of the Church. The maintenance, too, of liberty of worship implied not merely that persons professing other religions than Catholicism would be tolerated, but that religion was a matter of indifference, and that all religions were equally worthy of favor and protection. The Pope could not crown as defender of the Catholic Church a sovereign who should take such an oath, and until some explanation of its meaning were given, showing that it implied only the *civil* toleration of the persons professing these religions and not a *theological* toleration which should consider all religions as

¹² Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 37, Consalvi à Caprara, Roma, 6 Giugno, 1804, and 6th June, p. 564.

indifferent, the Holy Father could not accept the Emperor's invitation.

In the note accompanying this despatch Cardinal Consalvi pointed out that only a purely religious motive and the certainty of obtaining some important advantages for the French Church could justify the Holy Father in leaving Rome. In another letter of June 10¹³ the Cardinal asked for a formal declaration on the part of the Emperor, or, better still, of the Senate, of the precise meaning to be given to the terms of the oath, and a positive assurance that the journey would have a good result with regard to the religious questions which were still undecided.

The various objections to the journey of the Holy Father which had been suggested by the congregation of Cardinals were laid before Talleyrand in a note from Cardinal Caprara on June 25. He pointed out that the impediments caused by the oath should be removed in a satisfactory manner, and that the anointing and the coronation of the Emperor should be performed according to the Roman ritual. His Holiness would be willing to receive all the Bishops and priests who had returned to the Church, but he could not hold any communication with those who having abandoned the *Constitution Civile*, had afterwards maintained its principles in their writings and tried to spread them in their sees. It would be becoming to the glory of the Emperor and to the dignity of the Holy See that the letter of invitation should be brought to Rome, not by an ordinary courier, but by two Bishops. Talleyrand's reply is believed to have been written by the Bishop of Orleans, the Abbé Bernier, who had played such an important part in the negotiation of the Concordat. It stated that the Emperor was very much surprised that any objections should have been raised to a journey which would evidently prove so useful to religion, so glorious for the Holy See and so advantageous in every way to the Church, to France and to Europe. It enumerated the services which Napoleon had rendered to the Church and which he thought to be deserving of gratitude. The churches had been reopened, their altars raised again; seminaries had been founded and chapters endowed. The Neapolitans had been made to evacuate Ancona and give up Benevento and Ponte Corvo. The town of Pesaro, the fort of San Leo and the Duchy of Urbino had been restored to the Holy See. The foreign missions had been reëstablished and the Eastern Catholics were freed from persecution and protected. In the oath to be taken by the Emperor the words "the laws of the Concordat" would mean only the Concordat, and not a combination of the Concordat with the *Articles Organiques*. The liberty of religion, "*la liberté des cultes*,"

¹³ D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, p. 564.

is distinct from their essence and their constitution. It concerns only the persons who profess these religions, and to maintain it does not imply the approval of their principles or of their teaching. With regard to the *Articles Organiques*, the Emperor will listen with impartiality and respect to the Holy Father's observations, and will do what he can to satisfy him as far as it may be compatible with his position, with the welfare of the State and with his duty. The former Constitutional Bishops who still adhere to that Church shall be forced by His Majesty to respect the Concordat. The letter of invitation shall be presented to His Holiness by two Bishops, as he desires, or by Cardinal Fesch, and the reception of His Holiness in France shall be worthy of the greatness of the sovereign who has invited him and of the dignity of the Head of the Church.¹⁴

An unexpected obstacle to the journey of the Holy Father then arose. In a despatch of July 20 Cardinal Caprara announced that the Holy Father was only to anoint the Emperor, for the coronation would be considered as a purely civil ceremony and would take place in the Church of the Invalides. This was an innovation to which the Pope could not consent, and further correspondence took place with regard to this important question.

Talleyrand's letter was submitted to the thirty-four Cardinals then residing in Rome. They were not dazzled by its brilliant rhetoric nor duped by its vague diplomatic expressions. They doubted the sincerity of its flattering promises, and decided that more definite assurances should be demanded with regard to all the points to which objections had been raised.¹⁵ Cardinal Consalvi in his reply repeated those demands, and also stated that the Holy Father had noted and accepted Talleyrand's formal assurance that the expression "*les lois du Concordat*" did not comprise "*les Articles Organiques*," but meant only the 17 Articles agreed upon with the Holy See. He required, however, a more exact definition of "*la liberté des cultes*;" he observed that the Bishops who had belonged to the Constitutional Church had other duties to fulfill towards the Holy See besides the mere acceptance of the Concordat, and he asked for an explicit declaration that the ceremony of the coronation should not be separated from that of the anointing. Cardinal Fesch, as representing the Emperor in Rome, gave assurances on all these points which satisfied the Holy Father, and the tedious negotiation was at last ended on September 2, when Cardinal Consalvi informed Cardinal Fesch that, as His Holiness was satisfied with the assurances he had received with regard to the advantages which religion

¹⁴ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 586, Talleyrand à Caprara, 18th July, 1804.

¹⁵ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 594, Estratto analitico dei voti cardinalizi, fatto dal P. Fontana e presentato al Consalvi, 9-10 Agosto, 1804.

would derive from his journey to France, he would leave for Paris on receiving the official letter of invitation from the Emperor.¹⁶

To the Holy Father's surprise the letter was not brought to Rome by two Bishops, as had been promised, but by General Caffarelli, one of the Emperor's aides-de-camp. Its tone was respectful, but dry and formal, and it did not contain the assurance which the Holy Father had demanded—that the results of the journey would be of very great advantage to religion, an assurance which alone could justify, as no purely human motive could, the very great inconvenience which would be caused by the absence of the Sovereign Pontiff from Rome. Cardinal Fesch was therefore requested to obtain another letter from Paris which should fulfill that condition, but he refused, and recalled the assurances already given by Talleyrand in his letter of July 18 that the interests of the Church would be discussed between the Sovereign Pontiff and His Majesty, and that the results of their deliberations could not fail to be useful to religion. He added that the Holy Father might repeat Talleyrand's declaration in his allocution to the Holy College. The Cardinals were again consulted and asked to give their opinion with regard to this answer of the representative of France. Only Cardinal della Somaglia's answer has been found, but it seems to have expressed the decision of the majority—namely, that in any case the journey of the Holy Father to France would probably obtain some advantages for religion, while otherwise if the Emperor were offended, it would be impossible to foresee what injury he might inflict on the Church, in which he would be supported by public opinion and by the intrigues of the powerful party of the atheists and the Jansenists.¹⁷

Consalvi was, therefore, able to inform Cardinal Fesch on October 6 that the invitation was accepted, and the Holy Father announced his decision to the Sacred College in a Consistory held on October 29. In his allocution he praised Napoleon for having restored religion in France; it was to give, he said, as distinctly religious a character as possible to the Emperor's anointing and coronation that he had consented to go to France, and the Emperor had assured him

¹⁶ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

¹⁷ Eight years later Cardinal Consalvi, while in exile at Reims, wrote in his "Memoirs:" "All that the French Government did had no other object than to bring about the Pope's journey, for that Government was resolved not to observe any of its promises." The Cardinal also stated that the Pope's answer to Cardinal Fesch was intended to be "private and confidential," but that the newspapers were allowed to publish it in order to embarrass the Holy Father and render it impossible for him to retreat in case he was dissatisfied with any ulterior measures. (Cardinal Consalvi, "Mémoires," avec Introduction et Notes par J. Crétineau-Joly, Paris, 1864, t. II., pp. 400-402.)

that the interests of religion would form the chief object of the journey.

Cardinal Consalvi would seem to have entertained very little hope that any serious advantages, either spiritual or temporal, could be obtained by the Pope's journey to Paris. He knew by personal experience how hostile to the Church were most of the men then in power in France, and that Napoleon was mainly guided by his ambition; but he feared that to the Holy Father's refusal might be falsely ascribed whatever misfortunes might assail the Church in France, and he sought at least to obtain assurances which should clearly establish the fact that religious motives alone had impelled the Sovereign Pontiff to take such an unprecedented step.¹⁸ But in his letters to the Papal Nuncios in the different courts of Europe he frankly expressed his doubts and misgivings. He depicted the anxiety and the mental sufferings which the Holy Father had undergone in the course of these negotiations, and he alluded to the dangers which might have been incurred by a refusal. That the consent of the Holy Father was the result of long and serious deliberations is shown by his words to Mgr. Morozzo, the Nuncio in Florence, to whom he wrote on the day on which the Pope left Rome: "With regard to the general affliction caused by such a journey, allow me to answer you by an eloquent silence. You may see that it took us six months to say yes."¹⁹

Pius VII. left Rome on November 2, after celebrating Mass at the high altar of St. Peter's, in presence of an immense concourse of people. He was accompanied in his journey by Cardinals Antonelli, de Bayane, Borgia, Braschi, Caselli and di Pietro, five prelates and the chief officers of the Noble Guard, Prince Altieri and Duke Braschi. He had granted Cardinal Consalvi full powers for the spiritual and temporal government of the Papal States during his absence. Such was the Emperor's impatience to have his coronation speedily celebrated that courier after courier was sent to accelerate his journey. He was obliged to travel with a haste unbecoming to his dignity and injurious to his health; he was allowed to stop only two days in Florence, one in Turin and but a few hours in other places.²⁰

It was on November 25 that the Holy Father met the Emperor in the forest of Fontainebleau at the Cross of St. Hérem, on the road from Fontainebleau to Nemours. Napoleon had decided that that day a hunt was to take place, in the course of which he should meet the Pope, apparently by chance. Savary, Duke of Rovigo,

¹⁸ Consalvi, "*Mémoires*," t. II., p. 389.

¹⁹ Rinaldi, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

²⁰ Consalvi, "*Mémoires*," II., p. 403.

who a few months previously had presided at the execution of the Duke of Enghien, has given an account of this interview, the details of which he had probably been charged to arrange, and he confesses that the hunt was only a pretext in order to avoid all ceremony. On seeing the Emperor coming towards him, the Holy Father stopped his carriage, alighted on the wet road and went forward to meet him halfway. Savary remarks that the Pope, who was clothed in white and wore white shoes, hesitated to step down into the mud; "but," he adds, "he had to do it." "*Cependant il fallut bien qu'il en vint là.*" The Emperor's carriage was then brought up so as to come between the two sovereigns, as if by carelessness on the part of the servants. Two men had been stationed to open the doors at the same time, and as the Emperor entered on the right side, the Holy Father was forced to take his seat on the left. Savary observes triumphantly that this first step settled without any negotiations what should be the etiquette to be observed during the time of the Pope's stay in Paris.²¹ The Holy Father remained at the Castle of Fontainebleau for three days, and when he entered Paris with the Emperor he was, indeed, placed at his right hand, but the entry took place at night, so that the people should not remark the subordinate position held by their sovereign.²²

The marriage of General Bonaparte, then a penniless young officer, to Josephine Tascher de la Pagerie, the widow of Viscount Alexander de Beauharnais, which had taken place on March 11, 1796, at the municipality of the second *Arrondissement* of Paris, was a purely civil ceremony. Owing to the proscription of the clergy under the Directory, it would have been almost impossible at that time to have found a priest, and the indifference to all religious observances which then prevailed may also account for this neglect to obtain the blessing of the Church. In the following years Josephine had frequently asked Cardinal Fesch to persuade Bonaparte to have their marriage religiously celebrated, but without success. It has been usually believed that on the eve of the coronation the Empress, who was aware that Napoleon already thought of divorcing her, revealed to the Holy Father that she had been only civilly married, and that Pius VII. declared that unless her marriage were blessed by the Church he should refuse to perform the ceremony of the following day. On learning this decision Napoleon was much irritated, but finally yielded, on condition that the marriage should be celebrated secretly and without witnesses by Cardinal Fesch, who at once obtained the necessary dispensations from the

²¹ "Mémoires du Duc de Rovigo pour servir à l'histoire de l'Empereur Napoléon," Édition nouvelle, Paris, 1900, t. II, p. 9.

²² Consalvi, "Mémoires," II., p. 403.

Holy Father.²³ Another theory is founded on the declaration made by the Cardinal on December 26, 1809, before the *Comité Ecclésiastique* which was examining the question of Napoleon's divorce.²⁴ It was substantially the same as that which he made on January 6, 1810, to the diocesan official. Napoleon had sent for him on December 1, 1804, and told him that the Empress wished to receive the nuptial benediction, and that he consented, but that he insisted on absolute secrecy. Fesch then went to the Pope, and without declaring to him the state of affairs, told him that in his position as Grand Almoner he was or might sometimes be in very embarrassing situations and unable to have recourse to the authority of the Archbishop of Paris, because he should have to mention to him facts of the utmost importance which ought to remain concealed, as well as for other great and urgent reasons. The Pope replied: "I give you all the powers which I can give you." The Cardinal had then thought that he was sufficiently authorized to celebrate their Majesties' marriage without witnesses or previous publication of banns. When two days later the Empress asked him for a marriage certificate, he at first refused, but on her assuring him that the Emperor had consented, he granted it. Napoleon was, however, very angry with him for doing so.²⁵

²³ D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, t. I., p. 354. Henri Welschinger, "Le Pape et l'Empereur" (1804-1815), Paris, 1905, p. 30.

²⁴ When Pius VII. was imprisoned at Savona Napoleon formed, on 16th November, 1809, an Ecclesiastical Council, which he called his "Concil de Conscience," to help him to solve the religious difficulties which had arisen in Italy and in France. It was composed of Cardinal Fesch, president; de Barral, Archbishop of Tours; Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes; Mannay, Bishop of Trèves; Bourlier, Bishop of Éreux; Canaveri, Bishop of Vercelli; the Abbé Emery, superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and Padre Fontana, the general of the Barnabite order. Cardinal Fesch always showed himself thoroughly impartial; he blamed the way in which the Pope was treated, and sought to make amends for his imperious conduct when Ambassador at Rome. The Abbé Emery was the most highly esteemed and respected by Napoleon on account of the frankness and the courage with which he dared to oppose him. Padre Fontana, who resigned almost immediately, was devoted to the Church and to the Papacy, and was imprisoned from 1810 to 1814. The other members, though they were pious and learned prelates, were too subservient to the Emperor and too ready to make concessions to him. The Council was reorganized in January, 1811, with the addition of Cardinal Maury. Padre Fontana was replaced by Cardinal Caselli, and the Abbé de Prado, named Archbishop of Malines, replaced the Bishop of Vercelli. (Welschinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 103 and 158.)

²⁵ Welschinger, "Le Divorce de Napoléon," Paris, 1889, p. 99, gives Cardinal Fesch's declaration to the diocesan official on January 6, 1810. Father Bernard Duhr, in the "Leitschrift für Katholische Theologie," 1888, p. 601, believes that the Pope did not ask to have the marriage celebrated, and knew nothing about it, but gave the Cardinal extraordinary and general faculties on which he acted. He quotes the declaration made by Fesch on December 26, 1809, from *Le Correspondant*, 1856, Vol. XXXVIII., p. 958.

The ceremonial which should be followed at the Emperor's coronation was discussed at a meeting of the Council of State held at St. Cloud on June 14, and it was decided that the Emperor was not to receive the imperial insignia from the Pope, but to enter the church wearing them, lay them down to be blessed and take them up again.²⁶ On September 1, Portalis, the *Minister des cultes*, was charged with the regulation of the ceremonies. He suggested that they should be selected from the Roman ritual, and the *Cérémonial Français* formerly used at Reims for the coronation of the Kings of France, and that whatever did not suit modern French ideas should be set aside.²⁷ Cambacérès was named as his collaborator, and M. de Ségur, the grand master of the ceremonies, the Abbé de Pradt, and probably also Talleyrand were consulted. The Emperor, too, suggested some important changes, although Cardinal Fesch had assured him that the Roman ritual should be followed. This revised ceremonial, which omitted some of the old ceremonies and introduced others, accompanied by new forms of prayer, was presented to the Holy Father at a rather late hour on the eve of the coronation.²⁸ He consented to most of the changes, but some he refused to accept, and Napoleon was obliged to yield to his remonstrances.

The Cathedral of Notre Dame had been decorated with great splendor for the occasion. Outside it was surrounded by a Gothic portico leading from the main entrance to the Archbishop's palace, and the interior was hung with heavy draperies of green velvet embroidered with gold. The Papal throne stood on the left side of the choir. Two smaller thrones for the sovereigns were placed at the foot of the altar, and at the west end of the church, a short distance from the great door, was a throne raised upon twenty-four steps, where they were to take their seats when crowned. The Holy Father, who left the Tuileries at 9, put on the Pontifical vestments in the Archbishop's palace, whence he entered the Cathedral under a canopy borne by the canons, while an orchestra of 460 musicians intoned the "*Tu es Petrus.*" The delay of an hour and a half which followed before the arrival of the sovereigns had unfortunately the appearance of a deliberate intention to insult and humiliate the Holy Father, though it may be accounted for by the fact that, lest the two processions should meet, the Emperor had set out an hour later, and on arriving at the Archbishop's palace had to be clothed in the imperial robes. His procession, consisting of his marshals and the chief officers of State, wearing the splendid costumes designed by

²⁶ "Mémoires de Miot de Méliot, Conseiller d'état" (1762-1841), t. II, p. 195.

²⁷ "Le Livre du Sacre de l'Empereur Napoléon." Dessiné par Isabey. Texte par Frédéric Masson, Paris, 1908. F. Masson, "Le Sacre et le Couronnement de Napoléon," fifth edition, Paris, 1908.

²⁸ Rinierl, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

the painter David, passed through the portico and entered the Cathedral by the great door. The Emperor wore the imperial mantle; he held in his right hand the sceptre bearing an eagle, in his left a smaller sceptre surmounted by an ivory hand called *la main de justice*. He was crowned with a golden laurel wreath like the Roman Emperors, and the globe, the sword and the imperial were carried before him.²⁹ According to the French ritual the ceremony by the presentation of the King to the Archbishop of Reims, the celebrant, by two Bishops, who, in reply to the questions addressed to them, declared that they knew him to be worthy of the crown. He was then exhorted by the celebrant in a short discourse to perform his duties towards God, the Church and his subjects. For this part of the ceremony was substituted, at the Emperor's request, the chant of the *Veni Creator*, and the Emperor while kneeling gave the sceptre, the hand of justice, the mantle, the crown and the sword to various dignitaries to lay upon the altar. He then took the oath as given in the Roman ritual, by which he promised to observe and uphold the laws; to preserve peace for the Church and for the people, and to render due respect to the chief pastors of the Church; but the clause in the original by which the enjoyment of their property was guaranteed to the churches was omitted. The Litany was then sung. It was followed by the anointing of the sovereigns on the hands and on the forehead by the Holy Father, who then began to say Mass. At the Gradual he blessed the sword, the mantles, the rings, the crowns, in the order which had been assigned to them by the Emperor. In the Roman ritual these blessings were not prescribed; in the *Cérémonial Français* no blessing was pronounced over the mantle or the crown, and prayers, which the Pope was asked to accept, had therefore to be composed for the purpose.³⁰ The Emperor then received from the Holy Father the ring, the sword, the hand of justice and the imperial mantle, but he had already informed the Pope that he intended to crown himself. According to the *Cérémonial Français*, eleven of the great peers of France³¹ held the crown over the King's head, and the twelfth, the Archbishop of Reims, lowered it upon him. But Napoleon had declared that he wished to avoid any discussion between the dignitaries of the empire who might lay claim to give him the crown in

²⁹ This was one of the Emperor's innovations. According to the "*Cérémonial Français*," the sovereign to be crowned entered the cathedral wearing a tunic. The Roman ritual required him to be clothed in armor.

³⁰ "*Livre du Sacre*," p. 110.

³¹ The peers of France in the thirteenth century were the Dukes of Burgundy, Normandy and Guyenne, the Counts of Toulouse, of Flanders and of Champagne, the Archbishop of Reims, the Bishops of Laon, Langres, Beauvais, Chalons and Noyon. When those peerages had ceased to exist they were represented by other nobles.

the name of the people, and that it would suffice if, while he crowned himself, the Pope were to recite the usual prayer. Pius VII. seems to have assuaged. Napoleon stood, therefore, before the altar, girt with the sword, wearing the imperial mantle and carrying the sceptre and the hand of justice, while the Holy Father gave Josephine the mantle and the ring. He then gave the hand of justice to the *Archichancelier* Cambacérès, the sceptre to the *Architrésorier* Lebrun, and going up to the altar took the crown and crowned himself. Then, taking the Empress' crown, he placed it on her head, while the Pope recited the prayers used at a coronation.³² The sovereigns were then led by the Pope to the throne at the end of the church, where, having seated them, he turned to the assistants and exclaimed: "*Vivat Imperator in æternus!*" The words were taken up by all present; the choir repeated them, and the guns stationed on the banks of the Seine fired a salute. The Holy Father then returned to his throne, where he intoned the *Te Deum*, at the close of which he continued the Mass to the end.³³

According to the Roman ritual and the *Cérémonial Français* it was the custom for the sovereign to receive Holy Communion at the Mass of the coronation, and the ceremonies which should accompany it were inserted in the work on the coronation which had been drawn up according to the Emperor's instructions. As, however, he did not wish to go to confession, it was decided that it should not take place. When the Mass was ended the Holy Father left the Cathedral for the chapel of the Treasury, where he was to lay aside the Pontifical vestments, and during that time the Emperor took the oath prescribed by the *Senatus Consultum* which had raised him to the throne and which the Pope refused to sanction by his presence. It was administered by the Grand Almoner, Cardinal Fesch, who

³² The publication by Padre Rinieri of the original text of the prayers and the ceremonies employed at the coronation, as they had been arranged by Napoleon, refutes the legend, which appears to have been first related by M. Thiers, and which has been since repeated by other historians, namely, that Napoleon seized the crown before the Pope could take it up and crowned himself. The painter Isabey had been commissioned, together with the architects Percier and Fontaine, to paint the principal events of the ceremony. In the engraving in the "*Livre du Sacre*," which represents the coronation, Pius VII. is shown seated before the altar, while Napoleon stands at the epistle side, wearing the imperial mantle and with his left hand on the hilt of his sword. The crown which he is in the act of placing on his head is the golden laurel wreath which he wore on entering the church. An imperial crown, representing that of Charlemagne, is on the altar. It is also the laurel crown which he is shown wearing in the scene of the enthronization.

³³ This was perhaps the only point of the ceremonial with regard to which the Pope's objections prevailed over Napoleon's will. The Emperor had wished the "*Te Deum*" to be sung at the end of the Mass, after he had taken the oath prescribed by the *Senatus Consultum*.

carried the book of the Gospels from the altar to the imperial throne, and at the end the chief herald called out from the steps of the throne: "*Le très glorieux et très auguste Empereur Napoléon, Empereur des Français, est couronné et intronisé! Vive l'Empereur!*" The cry was answered by the acclamations of the brilliant crowd of officers and civil dignitaries which filled the church, and more salvos of artillery announced the end of the ceremony.

After the departure of their Majesties the Pope reëntered the Cathedral and passed through it in procession to the Archbishop's palace while the choir again sang the "*Tu es Petrus.*"

Pius VII. did not obtain those advantages for the Church which he had been led to believe would be the result of the sacrifices he made in undertaking the journey to Paris. He had at least the satisfaction of reconciling again with the Church the four Constitutional Bishops, who since their institution by Cardinal Caprara had relapsed into the schism. They now yielded to the affectionate remonstrances of the Holy Father and consented to sign a declaration by which they submitted to the decisions of the Holy See upon the ecclesiastical affairs of France.

The enthusiasm with which the Pope was received whenever he appeared in public must have shown him that though infidelity still predominated among the higher classes and in official circles, the sentiments of religion had not disappeared from the minds of the people. He could not, however, obtain the revocation of the *Articles Organiques*, nor the abolition of the law which sanctioned divorce, nor the restitution of the provinces which had been detached from the States of the Church by the Treaty of Tolentino. He had also asked that Catholicism should be acknowledged as the religion of the State; that the former laws regarding the observance of Sundays and feast days should be reënacted; that religious congregations of men should be allowed, and the salaries of the clergy augmented. M. Portalis was charged to reply to these demands and to clothe with an outward show of courtesy and a semblance of religious feeling the Emperor's decided resolution not to yield on these points. He mentioned, indeed, certain concessions which had already been made. Some congregations had been reëstablished, such as that of the Foreign Missions, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, the Sisters of Mercy. The ancient foundations in various parts of France belonging to the Irish, in which the Pope took a special interest, had been united in one, which the government promised to assist.³⁴ Chaplains had also been appointed in the army and the

³⁴ "Correspondance de Napoléon I.," t. VIII., p. 88, No. 6,375, 16th October, 1802. The Irish Colleges established at Toulouse, Bordeaux, Nantes, Douai, Lille, Antwerp, Louvain and the Scotch College of Douai are united with

navy, and the Bishops were granted a share in the management of the *Lycées* or government schools. On the other hand, the laws on the observance of Sunday could not be reënacted, but public functionaries had been forbidden to work on that day. The law which authorized divorce could not be repealed, but the clergy could refuse to celebrate the marriage of people who had been divorced.

The reply to the Pope's request that the Legations might be restored to the Holy See was entrusted to Talleyrand, who sought to compensate for the harshness of the Emperor's decision not to give up the lost territories by vague promises of future protection and protestations of admiration for the Holy Father's virtues and of devotedness to his interests. Even Napoleon thought Talleyrand's assurances insufficient, and to raise the hopes of Pius VII. he added some lines, in which he declared that if God should prolong his life he hoped to find opportunities which might enable him to consolidate and extend the Holy Father's possessions, and that even then he would help to extricate him from the difficulties caused by the late war. He would thus give a proof of his veneration for the Holy Father and of his desire to augment the splendor of our religion and cause it to be respected. Faithful to the plan which he had adopted from the beginning, he would glory in being one of the strongest supporters of the Holy See. He wished that the efforts which he had made to reunite to it the heart and the faith of the first nation in the world should be placed among the deeds which had illustrated his career.³⁵

These eloquent protestations of devotedness to the interests of religion form a striking contrast with the crimes against the Holy See of which Napoleon was guilty shortly afterwards. Even then Pius VII. could perceive how little Napoleon cared for the interests of the Church. While his demands for the restitution of the Legations were being answered with eloquent promises for the future the Emperor was preparing to change into a kingdom the Cisalpine Republic, of which those provinces formed a part. He announced his project at a special meeting of the Senate on March 7, 1805, as well as his intention of taking the crowns of the Lombard Kings at Milan, but added that the kingdom should remain separate from the empire, and be inherited by one of his children.³⁶

the Irish and Scotch Colleges of Paris. The Irish and Scotch Colleges of Paris shall be united in a single establishment. The director was to be alternately an Irishman or a Scotchman.

³⁵ D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, I., 375. Consalvi, "Mémoires," t. II., p. 407.

³⁶ On the coat-of-arms of the new kingdom were emblazoned, among other quarterings, the Papal keys and the Lion of Venice, as emblems indicating the origin of the provinces of which it was composed. (Consalvi, *op. cit.*, t. II., 410.)

Pius VII. had long been anxious to return to Rome, but under the pretext that the weather was bad and the roads dangerous Napoleon detained him in Paris in the hope, it was said, that he might be induced to crown him at Milan. When the Emperor at last left Paris for Milan on April 2, he decided that the Holy Father should follow him on the 6th and celebrate the feast of Easter at Chalons-sur-Saone, while he was to pass that day at Lyons, a much more important town, and where he apparently feared that the presence of the Sovereign Pontiff might deprive him of the homage of the multitude which he considered to be due exclusively to himself.

After crossing the Alps and passing through Turin, Parma and Modena, Pius VII. spent two days at Florence, where he received the abjuration of Scipione Ricci, the former Bishop of Pistoia and Prato. In a recent number of this REVIEW⁸⁷ have been described the efforts made by this prelate, aided by the Grand Duke Leopold I., to diffuse Jansenism throughout Tuscany, and the Synod which he held in Pistoia in 1786, the acts which were solemnly condemned in 1794 by the bull "*Auctorem Fidei*." After the election of Pius VII. Ricci had sent him a retraction of his errors, but this letter, as well as others previously addressed to the Archbishop of Florence, was found to contain equivocal expressions intended to dissimulate his adherence to the condemned doctrines. Ricci resigned his bishopric in 1800, but made no reply to the warnings he received from Cardinal Consalvi, and informed the Secretary of the Nuncio in Florence that he intended to "observe a respectful silence." When Pius VII. came to Florence the Queen of Etruria, Maria Louisa,⁸⁸ expressed to Ricci her wish that he should be reconciled with the Holy Father, and after a long hesitation he signed a form of abjuration presented to him by Mgr. Fenaia, the Vicegerent of Pius VII. He was then affectionately received by the Holy Father, but his Memoirs show that even while signing his retraction he persisted in maintaining, according to the usual custom of the Jansenists, that he had never held the erroneous doctrines condemned by the bull of Pius VI. It is even believed that though continuing to profess outwardly the sentiments declared in his retraction, his opinions, to judge by his Memoirs, underwent no modification up to the time of his death in 1810.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Vol. XXXI., July, 1906.

⁸⁸ Ferdinand III., the son of Leopold I., was expelled by the Directory in 1799. By the treaty of Lunéville, in 1801, he was given the Duchy of Salzburg as compensation, and Tuscany was made into the Kingdom of Etruria for Louis of Bourbon, Duke of Parma, who had been deprived of his State. The kingdom was united to the French Empire in 1807 and formed into three departments.

⁸⁹ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

The friendly relations which apparently existed between the Sovereign Pontiff and the Emperor were soon broken off by the latter, owing to the mania for universal domination both in political and religious matters, which ultimately caused his downfall. Napoleon's first infringement of the rights of the Holy See was the edict published at Milan on June 8, 1805, shortly after he had crowned himself with the iron crown of the Lombard Kings. By this decree, it is true, he reorganized the ecclesiastical affairs which had been thrown into disorder by the revolutionary government of the Cisalpine Republic; he reëstablished several of the congregations which had been suppressed; he put the Bishops, the seminaries and the parish churches in possession of a great part of their former revenues. But the same decree introduced the *Code Napoléon*, which authorized divorce; it ordered the property of the convents and monasteries which had been suppressed to be sold and the proceeds to be paid to the State; it fixed the age at which the monastic vows could be pronounced, and it had been drawn up and published without the coöperation of the Holy See, which was required by the regulations of the Concordat recently made between the Sovereign Pontiff and the Cisalpine Republic.⁴⁰

Pius VII. vainly remonstrated against this infraction of a solemn treaty. Napoleon replied, with some irritation, that the Holy See was slow in its action and would have taken some years to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of Italy; that he had therefore hastened to put them in order, and that he had empowered Cardinal Fesch to discuss the matter in Rome and to consent to whatever modifications should be possible. But Cardinal Fesch was warned by the Minister of Foreign Affairs that this discussion was to arrive at no result, and that the Emperor wished to hear no more about it.⁴¹

A more serious cause of disagreement, and one more displeasing to the Emperor, then arose. Napoleon's youngest brother, Jerome, whom he had placed in the navy, had married at Baltimore on 24th December, 1803,⁴² Elizabeth Patterson, the daughter of a wealthy merchant of that city. He was then a minor and had not obtained

⁴⁰ It had been signed in Paris on September 16, 1803, by Cardinal Caprara, acting for the Holy See, and by Ferdinando Mareschalchi, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Cisalpine Republic. Padre Ilario Rinaldi, S. J., "*La Diplomazia Pontificia nel Secolo XIX.*," Roma, 1902, t. II., pp. 219 and 315.

⁴¹ Cesare Cantù, "*Corrispondenze di diplomatici della Repubblica e del Regno d'Italia*" (1796-1814), Milano, 1884, p. 321. Instructions given to the Marchese di Birago, Plenipotentiary Minister of the Kingdom of Italy to the Holy See.

⁴² The marriage was celebrated by Bishop John Carroll (1735-1815), one of the Carrolls of Carrollton, an old Maryland family. Named Bishop of Baltimore in 1789, the first Bishop in the United States, and made Archbishop shortly before his death.

by two decrees dated 2d and 21st March, but he wished to obtain also a bull from the Holy See to the same effect. He founded his demand especially on the fact that the lady was a Protestant, and that it was of importance for the interests of religion in France that he should not have a Protestant so closely connected with him.

Jerome returned to Europe by way of Lisbon. He met the Emperor at Milan in the early part of May and seems to have been soon persuaded to allow his marriage to be annulled. The Emperor had already given orders that if Miss Patterson attempted to land she should be sent to Amsterdam and put on board a ship bound for America, but she took refuge in England. Pius VII. examined carefully the three memorials against the validity of the marriage which Napoleon had caused to be drawn up, and found that it was not in his power to annul it. In his reply to the Emperor he pointed out to him that "though marriages between Catholics and Protestants are abhorred by the Church, she considers them valid." The clandestinity of the marriage caused by the absence of the parish priest is an impediment established by the Council of Trent, but it exists only in the countries where its "decree, chapter I., section 24, *de Reformatione matrimonii*, has been published, and even there only with regard to the persons for whom it has been published." The Holy Father ordered most careful researches to be made in the archives of the Propaganda and of the Inquisition, but could not find that such had been the case, and the decree of a Synod held by the Bishop of Baltimore gave him further proof that it had not been published. Pius VII. therefore declared that he had not the power to annul a marriage of which the invalidity could not be proved.⁴³ Napoleon, who was already accustomed to be blindly obeyed, could not understand how a feeble and unimportant sovereign like the Pope could dare to resist his will, and ascribed it to a desire to be revenged for his refusal to restore the Legations. In October, 1806, he caused Jerome's marriage to be annulled by the diocesan officiality of Paris, and in August, 1807, he made him marry Frederica Catherine, the daughter of the King of Wurtemberg, a Protestant Princess. In a letter to the Emperor the Holy Father showed his disapprobation of this marriage by expressing a hope that, after the examination which he had made of the reasons which had been brought forward regarding the nullity of the Prince's first marriage, new and valid arguments had been found which had not been submitted to the consent of his mother, Madame Bonaparte, who made a formal protest against the marriage on February 22, 1805. As a *Senatus Consultum* of 18th May, 1804, had given the Emperor full jurisdic-

⁴³ Artand de Montor, "Histoire du Pape Pie VII.," Paris, 1836, t. II., p. 67. Letter of Pius VII. to Napoleon, 26th June, 1805.

tion over the members of his family, he declared the marriage null and void to him, which were therefore completely unknown to him, and in consequence of which this marriage had taken place.⁴⁴

Napoleon soon showed how very little gratitude he felt for the great service which the Holy Father had rendered to him, and how little he respected the rights of another sovereign when his own interests were concerned. Since some years a French garrison of from 15,000 to 20,000 men, commanded by General Gouvion de St. Cyr, had occupied Otranto, in Calabria, to guard against any alliance between the King of Naples and England or Russia. King Ferdinand was anxious that these troops should be withdrawn, and by a treaty signed in Paris on September 22 and ratified at Portici on October 8, 1805, he promised to observe a strict neutrality and not to allow the soldiers of the hostile powers to enter his States. Napoleon was then on the point of leaving Paris to open the campaign in which he suddenly and unexpectedly turned against Austria the great army which he had collected at Boulogne for the invasion of England. He was glad to be able to reinforce the troops which Marshal Massena commanded in Lombardy, and thus enable it to coöperate with those which he led. General St. Cyr was therefore ordered to march towards the north of Italy, and while on his way to place a garrison at Ancona,⁴⁵ which he did towards the end of October.

This unprovoked aggression on the part of the Emperor for whom he had done so much caused Pius VII. great surprise and uneasiness. He sent to Napoleon on November 13 a strong protest against this violation of his territory, which he had done nothing to deserve. His conduct towards the Emperor had given him the right to expect that he should be treated differently, but ever since his return from Paris he had experienced nothing but affronts and acts of discourtesy. As he wished to remain absolutely neutral, he demanded that Ancona should be evacuated or he would cease all relations with the Emperor's representative in Rome. Napoleon returned no answer to this letter until January 7, 1806, when he replied to it from Munich. Much had happened in the interval to inspire him with an exaggerated idea of his power, a greater contempt for his enemies and a more lively feeling of exasperation against all who dared to oppose him. His skillfully planned campaign had succeeded even beyond his hopes. The Austrians and the Russians had been beaten

⁴⁴ Artand de Montor, *op. cit.*, t. II., p. 177. Letter of Pius VII. to Napoleon, undated, but probably of September, 1807. D'Haussonville, *op. cit.*, t. II., p. 425.

⁴⁵ "Correspondance de Napoléon I.," t. XI., p. 298, No. 9,263. Paris, 23d September, 1805. To General Gouvion Saint-Cyr. He is ordered to march towards Pesaro. "En passant, vous placerez aussi garnison à Ancône."

in a series of victories, the most decisive of which was that of Austerlitz on December 2. The remains of the Russian army had been allowed to retreat, and Austria had sued for peace, which had been granted by the Treaty of Presburg. By it Venice, the Venetian provinces and Dalmatia were united to the kingdom of Italy, the Electors of Bavaria and of Wurtemberg had their States enlarged at the expense of Austria and received the title of King. At Naples an army of about 14,000 Russians from Corfu, under General Lasey, and 10,000 English from Malta, under Sir James Craig, had landed 19th November without opposition from the King and taken up positions in the neighborhood. But after the signature of the peace of Presburg Napoleon announced to his soldiers that the dynasty of Naples had ceased to exist. The Russians were ordered to return to Corfu, and the English, too few to be able to resist after the departure of their allies, retired to Sicily.⁴⁶

It was, therefore, in a tone of studied insolence, and as though Pius VII. had seriously offended him by daring to protest against the seizure of Ancona, that he accused the Holy Father of listening to evil counsels and of rejecting all his demands. He asserted that it was as protector of the Holy See, the troops of which were badly organized, that he had occupied Ancona to save it from falling into the hands of the English and the Russians. He declared that he would continue to protect the Holy See, in spite of its blunders and its ingratitude, for he considered himself, like his predecessors of the second and third dynasties, as being the eldest son of the Church, and the only one who had the sword for her defense. Whenever the Holy Father would listen only to the counsels of his heart and to those of the true friends of religion, he would be his friend.

In a letter of the same date to Cardinal Fesch Napoleon displayed still more contempt for the Holy See. He called the Pope's protest ridiculous and insane. He ordered Fesch to declare that he would tolerate no Russian or Sardinian representatives in Rome. If Cardinal Consalvi loved his country, he should resign or do his bidding. Like Constantine, he, too, could appoint a Senator to govern in his name in Rome. "With regard to the Pope, I am Charlemagne, because, like Charlemagne, I unite the crown of France to that of the Lombards, and my empire touches the East. Their conduct (that of the Pope and the Cardinals) towards me must be regulated from that point of view. If they behave well, I shall make no change in outward appearances; if they do not, I shall reduce the Pope to be Bishop of Rome."⁴⁷

⁴⁶ "Correspondance de Napoléon I.," t. XI., p. 620, No. 9,626. Ducamp Impérial de Schœnbrunn, Décembre 27, 1805. "Annual Register," 1806, p. 135.

⁴⁷ "Correspondance de Napoléon I.," t. XI., p. 643, No. 9,656. Munich, 7th January, 1806. To Cardinal Fesch.

His letter to Pius VII. on February 13 was still more explicit. He blamed him for the consideration which he showed to heretical powers, and told him: "Your Holiness is sovereign of Rome, but I am its Emperor. All my enemies must be yours. It is not becoming that any agent of the King of Sardinia, or any English, Russians or Swedes should reside in Rome or in your States, or that any vessel belonging to these powers should enter your ports." Cardinal Fesch was ordered at the same time to insist that these demands should be satisfied and to inform the Papal Government that "I (Napoleon) am Charlemagne, the sword of the Church, their Emperor; that I must be treated as such; that they should not know if an empire of Russia exists. I inform the Pope of my intentions in a few words. If he does not acquiesce, I shall reduce him to the condition in which he was before Charlemagne."

Before answering these almost insane outbursts of wounded vanity and arrogance on the part of the Emperor, intoxicated with his brilliant military success, the Holy Father consulted the Cardinals then present in Rome to the number of thirty-two, and with only one exception, that of Cardinal Bayane, a Frenchman, who believed that submission to the will of the Emperor would be more prudent, they replied that the independence of the Holy See should be maintained at any price, as it was so intimately connected with the advantage of religion. Pius VII. then replied to the Emperor (21st March, 1806) in a frank and outspoken tone such as Napoleon was not accustomed to hear. He pointed out to him that the duties inseparable from his position rendered it impossible for him to yield to the Emperor's demands. It was his duty to be at peace with all, without making any distinction between Catholics and Protestants. He could not infringe that rule unless it were necessary to repel a hostile invasion. Moreover, there were millions of Catholics in the Empire of Russia and in the Kingdom of England, where they enjoyed the free exercise of their religion. What would become of them if those governments were irritated by the unprovoked expulsion of their subjects and the closure of the ports? To Napoleon's haughty assertion that he was Emperor of Rome, Pius VII. replied that the Sovereign Pontiff had never acknowledged within his States any power superior to his own, and that no Emperor could claim any right over Rome. Charlemagne had found Rome in the hands of the Popes; he confirmed their possessions without reserve and enlarged them by new donations. He bore the title of *Avvocato*, or Defender of the Roman Church, and like the other Princes who also bore it, sought to protect her from war, and not to drag her into it. To pretend that His Majesty's enemies should also be those of the Holy See would oblige the Pope to make war against any Cath-

olic power with which His Majesty should be at war. It would render the Sovereign Pontiff the vassal of the French Empire.⁴⁸

But Napoleon's pride was too great to allow itself to be influenced by any appeal to his sense of justice or gratitude. Talleyrand was instructed to inform Cardinal Caprara that the Emperor was much irritated by the Holy Father's communication of his letters to the College of Cardinals, which he looked upon as a breach of confidence and an act of perfidy on the part of Consalvi, although Cardinal Fesch had insisted upon it. From thence forward Napoleon's hostility and his designs against the temporal power of the Holy See showed themselves more openly, and aggressions against the Papal Government quickly followed each other.

In spite of the overbearing manners constantly displayed by Cardinal Fesch and his enmity towards Cardinal Consalvi, Napoleon felt that he could not reckon on his help to carry out his plans against Rome. He was therefore recalled and replaced on May 17 by M. Alquier, who had been Ambassador at Naples. His departure was followed by the seizure of Civit  Vecchia in the beginning of June by a body of French troops, who were apparently on their way from Naples to Tuscany. This took place without any negotiation with the Papal Government, as in the case of Ancona, and simply because it suited the Emperor to command the coast of the Mediterranean as well as that of the Adriatic. At the same time a decree sent to the Senate and published in the *Moniteur* of 6th June, 1806, declared that as the duchies of Benevento and Pontecorvo (two Papal provinces situated within the frontiers of the kingdom of Naples) had been a source of litigation between the King of Naples and the Court of Rome, in order to end these difficulties they were made into fiefs immediately dependent on the empire. The former of these was given to Talleyrand, the latter to Marshal Bernadotte, and in both cases with the title of Prince.

Cardinal Consalvi was then forced to resign. He had long been the object of calumnious attacks on the part of the Emperor, who believed, or feigned to believe, that it was he who encouraged Pius VII. in his resistance to the imperial will; that he was sold to the English, and was organizing a revolt against France. In the hope, therefore, that his retiring from public life might appease the Emperor and avert the storm which threatened the Papacy, the Cardinal gave up his post on June 17 and was succeeded by Cardinal Casoni.

⁴⁸ Artand de Montor, *op. cit.*, t. II., p. 125.

But this sacrifice could not stop the onward march of Napoleon's aggressive policy, for he had now thrown aside all semblance of respect for the Sovereign Pontiff. In July General Lemarrois, an *aide-de-camp* of the Emperor's, was ordered to seize all the taxes paid to the Papal Government in the duchy of Urbino, the province of Macerata and at Sinigallia and Pesaro. At Cività Vecchia, Mgr. Negreta, the Papal Governor, having refused to obey General Duhesme, the commander of the imperial troops, was seized and sent to Rome. But these spoliations and the violent language employed by the Emperor towards Cardinal Caprara could not intimidate the Holy Father or the College of Cardinals and cause him to close his ports to English vessels or allow the fortresses of the Papal States to be occupied by the French troops in the case of the landing of a hostile army, even though the Emperor should guarantee to him the possession of his States in the event of his complying.

In September, 1807, General Lemarrois was named Governor General of Ancona, Macerata, Fermo, Spoleto and Urbino; but the Holy Father still resisted. He would not consent to enter into a federation with France, which would place him in a state of perpetual warfare. He would not allow his communications with the Catholics of the British Empire to be interrupted. He refused to renounce the rights of the Holy See over Benevento and Pontecorvo; to raise the number of the French Cardinals to one-third of the Sacred College, and the Cardinals whom he consulted also rejected these demands.

Napoleon then executed the plan of campaign which he had long prepared. General Miollis received orders to march with 2,500 men from Tuscany towards Perugia, while Lemarrois led the same number to Foligno. There Miollis took the command and marched upon Rome, under the pretext of passing through it on his way to Naples. Joseph Bonaparte, recently named King of Naples, was to send 3,000 men to Terracina, and there wait for orders from Miollis. Napoleon insisted on both secrecy and rapidity in this operation. Miollis on entering Rome was to seize the Castle of St. Angelo, and if any insurrection broke out, he was to suppress it with grapeshot. The carefully prepared plot succeeded without any resistance on the part of the Papal troops. On the morning of February 2, 1808, the French entered Rome by the Piazza del Popolo. The Papal soldiers were disarmed, the Castle of St. Angelo seized. The Palace of the Quirinal was surrounded with cavalry and infantry and a battery of eight guns was pointed against it. Pius VII. was at that moment celebrating the feast of the Purification in his private chapel in presence of the Sacred College. The ceremony proceeded without interruption, and at its close "the French officers," says Cardinal

Pacca, "were surprised to see the Cardinals enter their carriages and drive away without showing on their countenances any signs of emotion."

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TEMPLARS AN EXPEDIENCY.

A CONCLUSION one may safely come to is that the suppression of the Templars was rendered expedient by the danger of a schism into which Philip IV. would have carried France. The absolute authority of the Holy See in a matter of the kind is elementary law. In the decree this is implied by way of recital, as if Clement anticipated criticisms on his justice in the matter. If he expected criticism, he was not mistaken, for there has been no public act of the Holy See so warmly debated.

The sound view I submit is that Clement understood his age. It was no longer possible to launch the States of Europe on a crusade by appeals to devotion to the Cross and pity for the Christians of the East "in the danger" of the infidel. The knight and noble, the esquire and the novice of chivalry might still spit out when they spoke the name of Mohammed,¹ but they had their pursuits at home and they recognized to the full extent their liege lord's claims. The liege lord himself thought his interests lay if not within his own domain, at least on his frontiers; and he had a good reason, for his neighbors—sovereign dukes or counts, knights or barons, would take advantage of his absence to seize upon his territory. Not a single State could be trusted. The maritime republics whose fleets were the principal means of transportation from Europe fought each other and entered into alliance with the Saracens against each other and against the cause of the Christian commonwealth when it suited their interest. It is no exaggeration to say that Venice drove as hard a bargain with the Crusaders to carry them across the Adriatic as though there were no common idea in the enterprise. Genoa was baser, if possible, than her rival, for she openly fought for the Turk, as they frequently called the Saracens, against her rival. Venice for every service must obtain lines of seacoast, ports and commercial cities and stations all round the Adriatic to the archipelago and along Asia Minor to the Levant. When the

¹ The Crusader's form of Mohammed. The Crusaders called this battle-cry of the Moslems thus: "Lillies;" for the war shout, "Allah il Allah Mohammed." Resoul Allah had such a sound borne from a distance.

European princes saw their resources squandered, their subjects decimated in the East apparently for no purpose but to enrich Italian trading towns and to maintain titular Kings of Jerusalem, Orientalized Norman, Italian and French dukes, marquises and counts here and there from Damascus to Ptolemais, from Engadine to Pilgrim Castle, they do not surprise one by their lack of enthusiasm for crusading. The Popes could only organize a crusade by paying Kings and nobles as an Italian despot of the same time, an Italian republic of the same time would hire mercenaries for those bloodless battles which were the scorn and laughter of the German and the Frenchman.

The money was hard to get, and much of what was got remained with collectors, with great and small nobles and sovereign princes for the exeat of what went to Rome. This Boniface VIII. was blind to. The influence of the Holy See was apparently at the zenith; in reality it was sapped by the Renaissance at the close of the thirteenth century. No doubt the moral ruin of the fifteenth and sixteenth century Renaissances was not reached; there was at least the intellectual habit of virtue, patriotism, loyalty and respect for religion, but it had no more authority than the black man's fetish. It was beaten, this mental virtue, like the fetish when the rainmaker brought down no showers to the parched earth, when the sunshine priest failed to call out heat and light from the dense masses of cloud whose contents were turning the country into a swamp. The baronage of Rome would throng around a Pope's palfrey to-day, put him on a donkey to-morrow, the sacred feet bound beneath the animal's belly, the blessed face turned to its tail.

Indeed, the wonder is how any man could desire the greatest and most unhappy dignity on earth; how any Pope could live among the detestable baronage and populace of Rome. Popes saw what Italy was from Rome to Spartivento on the south, from Rome to Mount Cenis on the north. They saw Bishops lawless as the most reckless lay lords and incomparably more insolent. Henry II. of England and Philip Augustus of France led by his bridle the horse of a Pope who would be starved to death in prison or strangled by the executive of emancipated Rome. Beyond the Alps the Pope was the Vicar, though harsh things might be written by Grosse Teste of Lincoln about the Curia and the plague of locusts filling the passages and carrying circumlocution orders from desk to desk of each jurisdiction and from one jurisdiction to another. A reverence for one as divine was the feeling for the Pope outside Italy, despite annuities and tithes for one thing or another, despite the grumbling of Bishops and abbots, priors and parish priests, who set the example of disobedience to the laity high and low.

It was upon this attachment of veneration, a thing made up of the passion of tears and the passion of brave men who for love of the Lord and Master would face "fearful odds" for the Vicar, that the high-hearted Benedetto Gaetani stood as on a rock. The difference between himself and Clement was that the latter saw what Boniface could not see—the change which was expressed to him with brutal insolence by Peter Flotte, that the King his master had the power whether or not Boniface possessed the authority he claimed from God. If this difference is borne in mind the question of the Templars, so far as Clement's duty to them and to the Church extended, can be very fairly decided. The frenzy of Philip the Fourth's hatred of Boniface is not uncommon among able and ambitious sovereigns who find the policy on which their hearts are set blocked by the opposition of another's conscience. How often Henry II. stormed and swore like a madman, tearing his lips with his teeth until finally with the bloody froth flying from his mouth he flung himself on and gnawed the straw carpeting the hall before he issued the command to murder the Archbishop in the shape of an appeal to the fidelity of gallant men. The wild rants of Philip IV. were methodical; they have even a touch of devilish humor in their ferocity, like the reply, I think, to the Bull *Clericos laicis*. Clement's behavior towards this savage bull, endowed with infinite human craft, is the most extraordinary victory of patience, good sense and sagacious use of the advantages supplied by the changes of the political barometer that one will find in all history. It was at the cost of the suppression of a great military order of the Church? Not a bit of it, but Philip thought this the price of abandoning his pursuit of the memory of the murdered Boniface.²

It seems to me clear that Philip would have driven the Templars out of France if he could have done so safely. I doubt if he would be restrained if it were only a spiritual order that had stood in his way. But to attack a great body of knights, to whose help the best army of Europe would be gathered from Germany and every part of Italy, from Spain and the nations of the north, from Cyprus; in a word, to the Grampians and the Shannon, was a task on which Philip and his lawyers would not embark. They should be prosecuted as great delinquents, guilty of heresy, idolatry, devil-worship, magic and such abominations as could not be named.

It cannot be disputed that the confessions as they appear on the record are admissions of guilt in every article just stated. I put

² I have no hesitation in employing the word murder. *Seina Colonna* actually attempted murder, but was prevented by de Nogaret, who himself is said to have struck him. Three days' starvation, insults, blows for a man of the Pope's age would be likely to prove fatal, at least to shorten life.

them aside for the present and take up the external evidence given in England, where the inquests were more fairly conducted than in France.

This came from various classes of witnesses, and in no instance can I find testimony that would stand the test of a modern system of inquiry. It was all hearsay, rambling, unrestricted, inconsistent. The accused were absent generally, and, of course, there was no cross-examination. It is worth observing that upon the whole the English knights were acquitted. There were witnesses who may have honestly believed the hearsay they were relating, witnesses who invented or enlarged the hearsay, and then passing to France we have the testimony of renegades who had left the Church and the order, and we have informers who had been degraded and expelled from the order. The evidence of the two last mentioned classes I include in the external evidence as not proceeding from torture, but voluntarily given.

I may here observe that as there were witnesses of the last class to tell whatever they might know in reality of terrible secrets, the commonly asserted story that such a knowledge in the possession of brethren or servants who disapproved of or who even were suspected of disapproving of the iniquities was a sentence of death or perpetual imprisonment in the dungeons of the order. Therefore one may well ask: What induced the renegade to leave? Why was the degraded knight³ allowed to take away his knowledge of appalling secrets? Though according to the uncritical method of the time in dealing with evidence, judges might honestly conclude that hearsay testimony was valid, we are to deal with it in compliance with modern rules, because by these rules alone the value of the evidence can be ascertained. Spiritual judges even then came nearer to the modern safeguards than temporal judges; we have proof of this in Philip's declaring that Clement had less zeal for the good name of the Church than he himself had. Philip made the declaration of protest because Clement was trying to secure fair play when he learned what was being done in the investigations and the violation of law in their inception. Philip would allow no safeguards; Clement saw, as any spiritual judge even then would see, that animosity or interest or haste prevented justice.

It appeared to Philip that the guilt of the order was so manifest⁴

³ The Bull "*Faciens Misericordiam*," August 12, 1308. Based to some extent on the confessions of the seventy-two at Poitiers. Recited that one knight of noble race and of no slight esteem had deposed on oath secretly to the enormities. Circular letter to the king as Clement passed through Toulouse, in which the Pope declares his conviction of the order's guilt.

⁴ The knights, wherever in exile they were safe, declared the innocence of the order—*adjurantes se objecti criminis prorsus insontes*.

that there should be no delay in inflicting the terrible punishment of the stake on those who refused to confess or who retracted their confessions. In other words, his mind had been made up before trial; so trial was a travesty in France. The Holy Father, on the other hand, was indignant that proceedings against a religious order should have been taken by the temporal power without the necessary authority from the Holy See, and the more particularly as the initial step was an imprisonment, as though the Templars were guilty, and the second step the application of the question by varied and extreme torture, the reading an account of which at the close of six centuries paralyzes the brain and stops the beating of the heart.

Before proceeding further I hint that Philip's hatred of the order, which is a factor with those who defend the knights, is based on *ex post facto* suggestions rather than on proof of the existence of the feeling. This is the case even with Guizot, who comes nearest to my own views as to the ambition of Philip, and I add that despite his pretended zeal for the good name of the Church, Philip was moved by an intense determination to subjugate the Church in France, and, so far as he could accomplish it, in every other State, to the authority of the secular power.⁵ Imbert, the chief of the Inquisition, should have seen this, but he embarked on the inquiry without regard to the law which required the Pope's sanction before noted.

Philip had no reason for hating the order. He had found refuge in the Temple when he fled for his life from the citizens of Paris, maddened by hunger owing to his terrible taxation and the unprecedented debasement of the coinage. He had obtained a loan from the order to pay the dowry of his daughter on her marriage with Edward II. of England. It is said he asked to be admitted to the order and was refused. I fail to see in what quality he could be received and remain King. There were no exoteric Templars in analogy with the Proselytes of the Gate, or the uninitiated members of certain cults and philosophies, but on this unproved and improbable request is in part based the theory of inexorable hate which drove on the King to the ruin of the order. It is curious the cross-lines of argument and criticism displayed concerning Philip's motives. Guizot hardly sees the aggrandizement of the monarchy as the inspiration, though he speaks of Philip as a man whose only thought was his own interest and the things that served his ambition. Michelet is coerced by the confessions to believe the charges, yet he

⁵ Boniface VIII's Bull, "*Laicis clericis*," so hurt the feelings of an English Catholic convert named Dill that he expressed them warmly in *The Nineteenth Century*. He should have written an apologia for Philip. Modernism is abroad; the encyclical has only scotched the snakes. "Up, guards, and at 'em," I mean Irish.

condemns Clement as the tool of Philip. From the first French churchmen imported their Gallicanism, French laymen their politics into a question which should have been dealt with in the serene air of history. As for the Italian historians, an Avignon Pope has judged with something of the passionate prejudice with which Dante condemns Boniface VIII., the shibbelene.

I do not think Philip cared very much personally; at any rate his unequalled craft concealed his feelings when there was a reason for concealing them. The idea of prerogative in its extremest form absorbed all other ideas. He reminds me of our own Charles I. Both were pious in a way, and both were past masters of that incredible duplicity which deceives, takes payment and absolves itself for the deception and the keeping of the money. Du Molay the very day before his arrest was a pall-bearer at the funeral of the King's sister. A short time before that Philip, as I have stated, had obtained from the order as a loan the money needed for his daughter's dowry on her marriage to Edward II. It is said that their demand for repayment caused his resolution to destroy them. Allowing for the pride of Kings, no King in the Middle Ages, save a madman like John of England, would have set about the task of destroying a religio-feudal organization merely because it asked for its own.

It was safe enough to plunder the Jews and Lombards by exacting loans and then driving them from the kingdom. It is not so easy to follow this astute prince's career through its intricacies and involutions any more than it is easy to understand why he has been abandoned by all writers except by theologians, and even the advocacy of these is restricted to the quarrel with the Templars and Boniface VIII. One may understand the expulsion of the Jews, for they were eating into the substance of property, as parasites will fasten on a body and waste it away. They were as the *taeniae*, the *trichinae*, which, if unchecked before vital functions are penetrated, possess the victim, be it cattle, be it swine, be it man. But the Lombards were not merely usurers; they were bankers and great leaders in trade and commerce. No commercial country but had its Lombard quarter, like Lombard street in London. From its houses the bills went forth from the English staples, the Flemish factories, the French granaries for commodities carried in Genoese bottoms to Marseilles, to Antwerp, to London.

When Philip was guided by those great lawyers, La Flotte, de Nogaret, de Plasian, great feudal magnates themselves, he would not, surely, deal with a wealthy and powerful society sustained, one may suppose, by the strongest sentiments and associations of the age and whose members belonged to every distinguished house in France,

as he did with the Jews and the Lombards. If he did so, his passionate desire for the aggrandizement of his house and theirs and his for the establishment of an absolute monarchy uncontrolled by external authority of any kind, supreme in the field of morality and that of civil law, self-sufficing, imperial as Rome was under Augustus, irresponsible as Byzantium was when Constantine placed the resources of the State at the service of the Bishops on their way to Nicea and during the sessions of the Council; if, I say, he aimed at destroying such an organization in order not to pay a debt, his hope and the daring imagination of the great lawyers named had passed into the limbo of empty dreams, disappointed aspirations, defeated policies.

They understood their time too well to countenance what would be a folly, ignoble as perilous. Of course, they knew that Philip had not a particle of conscience in money matters. He was fertile in expedients of taxation. The infamous method of repairing the finances—namely, the debasement of the coinage, was three times resorted to by him. He was more consistent, at least more determined, than the leaders of the Revolution when they dealt out their assignats, a cartful of which would hardly procure a meal in the poorest cabaret.⁶ He insisted that the debased coin should not be accepted for the King's taxes; the assignats were only refused when *ci-devants* or suspected *ci-devants* offered them. Any one might be a suspected *ci-devant*; if a man had a handsome daughter he was as sure to be a suspected *ci-devant* as if he were seen to bless himself, or if it were told that he said prayers in the old-fashioned way to the Lord Christ, His Mother and the saints, instead of to the poor Bacchante, wild-eyed, a *beaucoup pres decolleté*, who sat as Goddess of Reason on the high altar of Notre Dame.

But though they did not oppose Philip's levies on his subjects, the ministers would not sustain his attacking a feudatory who was only guilty of taking the King's promises to pay, or a great baron who rode at the head of five hundred men at arms and ten thousand footmen, such as they were, and who in such a quarrel would be backed by nobles and commons. The fact is, every noble considered himself as good a gentleman as the King, and a dishonor to one of them would be resented by all unless complicated by other elements. The word *peer* would indicate equality in which the King was only *primus inter pares*. True, it was only in England that a nobleman was a legislator, but he was a legislator in early days not by right, but by summons. I am therefore convinced that a war against a body of men related to every house of distinction in France for

⁶ Philip for a moment allowed the debased coin to be taken at the face value.

demanding payment of what the King owed them would be fatal to the monarchy, the very thing the sovereign feudatories wanted to make them go out against their primus, as in the War of the Public Good.

The genius of Philip Augustus enabled him to preserve his dignity among these haughty and ambitious vassals; the high character and the deep veneration of all classes for St. Louis enabled him to hold the homage of these powerful, almost independent princes in his keeping; but Philip Augustus and St. Louis were the only Kings who could do so with any show of success from the time of the great Hugh Capet himself to the moment with which we are dealing. The attack upon the Templars had a deeper meaning than wounded pride or rapacity. I do not deny that these feelings entered into the execution of a policy which had taken shape early in the pontificate of Boniface VIII., and towards which the destruction of the Templars was a most important if not necessary step.

The order was not condemned—it is proper to bear this in mind, though I am not going to develop the considerations suggested by the fact—but there appeared to be in the investigations in France and other countries such a mass of appalling proofs that the Holy See and its advisers could only conclude that reform was impossible. It is a remarkable fact that we find no expressions of pity or sympathy among the masses or in the 9,000 manors over Europe where the vassals of the order lived under better conditions than the vassals of lay lords. Their vassals show no part of the affection or even the partisanship of feudal loyalty such as was exhibited towards lay lords in their trouble. The suppression of the monasteries in England was not accomplished by a King's "I will it," or by Thomas Cromwell's handwave.

Terrible accusations had been growing against the English religious houses ever since the accession of the Plantagenets. A writer who plays the part of candid friend says the murder of St. Thomas postponed the Reformation in England three centuries. The view is adopted by criticism that is by novelty. But in any case the monks, who were the object of the village bard's pasquinades, the subject of the poet's malicious insinuations, the victim of the politician's rancor and the mark for the wit of every Autolicus who traveled with his wares from town to town, from village to village, were not driven forth until every tree from the midland counties to Berwick was a gallows. These betrayed and murdered peasants might have laughed at a morality, a miracle play or an abbot of unreason's antics, laughed at the biting jests which linked the horned devil to some high ecclesiastical scholar puffed up with what the simple laity never liked and what they came to call carnal wisdom, laughed when

the counterfeit of a fat monk too intimate with the leading yeoman's wife was lead over bog and marsh, through briar and brake, by the ignis fatuus, laughed when the representative of the attenuated monk whose covetous eyes showed that asceticism was not the cause of his pallor and meagreness was deprived of his collection before their eyes by some outlaws in Lincoln Green with long bows in their hands, and so on; these betrayed and murdered peasants might have often jested over the monks and their laziness, their liking for the good wife's posset, the good man's pot of mighty ale, their itching palm and the suspicion of things far worse, but in the hour of darkness, when the perjured King and his infamous vicar general were laying heavy hands upon the house and its curtilage, the chapel and its treasure, they remembered that no one failed to get a loan to replace his cattle dead from disease, or to buy seed for the tillage land, no one impoverished by bad seasons but found his larder replenished from the monastery, no wretched wanderer but passed the gate to the fireplace in the guest room, the table there, the clean straw and bed covering in the guests' dormitory.

I have evidence more or less convincing that the Templars were generous and indulgent landlords. One of the charges against them was their extravagance, their lavishness in gifts. I do not mean to say that this would prove that they were easy in the rents levied from their vassals, because I have heard of Irish landlords being extravagant and generous in gifts; it might lead, in fact, to the opposite conclusion were it not that they had as a fixed income a vast part of the continued tenths from layman's land and churchman's land for the Crusades.

Moreover, they only came to their European homes at long intervals, possibly enriched each one of them by his peculium from the ransom of some highly placed infidel, from the beaten enemy's camp, from the captured town, from the town given to the sack. In less than a generation after the nine founders issued their rescript of poverty, the painted lances, the silk underclothing, the gold-mounted chain armor, the gold stirrups, the gold hilts, the Arab steeds showed a far progress from the days when one horse served for two knights, when meat was eaten only three times in the week, when druggit and sacking were the clothing and a coarse frieze for the white mantle instead of a sable-lined cloak of silk or satin or velvet of Genoa.

I suggest that these grand seigneurs, as I may describe them, with the offerings of Europe and the spoils of Western Asia, would not wring the last coin from their serfs, would not pass the despoiling knife between hair and hide like the savage barons who warred with each other, like petty Kings and wasted with fire each others lands.

I suggest that the preceptor of the house to which the serf paid his manorial dues, a haughty gentleman indeed, but, as a religious, was magnificent in his generous kindness, and I suggest it on our knowledge of the easy rents and the untiring benevolence of the monastic houses of the spiritual orders.

This has, I think, some bearing on the case. No writer seems to have taken it into account as an element in judging the character and conduct of the knights. There were some sayings about them almost like proverbs. "Beware the kisses of a Templar," the little boys in England would say. Richard I. in his legacies to the clergy and religious bequeathed his pride to the Templars, his rapacity and licentiousness to the secular and what I may for distinction sake call the spiritual religious. I am not at all ready to accept charges against members of the religious orders; I certainly, from some slight historical knowledge, judge a posteriori and confirm my a priori sentiments that a body of religious men could not be depraved, though individuals might. At any rate, the inquisition into the monastic houses in England was a complete triumph for the monks, and I see no reason to think that the fire and energy of the military life should have led the Templars to habits of inconceivable, nameless turpitude.⁷ There is one thing clear, that Richard of England in bequeathing his arrogance to the Templars meant the very fault which every one recognized and which their greatest patron, Innocent II., spoke of in the most scathing terms. If there was any thing else, Richard would have endowed them with it, and I am sure Innocent would not have spared them. You see, I refuse to attach importance to outside reports. People are so foolish in a weak way, a radically evil way, that though good enough themselves, they are very ready to believe things affecting reputations. One scandalous tongue may start a malignant lie, and it will run like wildfire. A village gossip seeing a Templar enter the postern of his preceptory at a late hour could not think the absence was for anything but a criminal assignation.

He could not think the knight had been sitting by the bedside of a sick or dying friend, or had gone out in answer to a sudden summons from some one in distress or in danger. The common defamer, the oracle of the smith's forge, usually the council chamber of the village pundits, the Solomon of the tap room or kitchen of the village inn, or whatever he may have been, passed in the moment that the knight went through the small and secret gate. The postern

⁷ One knight under torture scouted the interrogatory. "We had plenty of money to purchase the favors of the most beautiful women." An old knight, when told that the Grand Master had confessed, declared he lied in his threat or was belled.

was a circumstance pregnant with suspicion—so those knights of the Preceptory of Dinelee, let it be—I will have something to say about a place so named—were among the classes in the Apocalypse that shall not enter heaven.

One member coming home late at night figured as a whole preceptory whose nights were spent in debauchery.

At any rate, the whole history of the alleged backsliding of the order is obscure. It is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion, and one gets no assistance, I think, from the defenders of the knights or the apologists of Clement. I am not aware that any one has *per se* defended Philip. Surely the modern school of Clemenceau, Combes, Waldeck-Rousseau, of the Panama Canal men, the Zola schoolmasters and the progressive rulers who have made the national deficit might find something to say for Philip, who was an asserter of their own principles and policy incomparably more able and tactful than themselves, as I shall show by and by. They owed him a word for supplying the financial precedent of confiscating religious foundations to fill a treasury void.

There must have been some purpose in the minds of Philip and Clement when they were said to have met in the mysterious fashion reported in the wood of St. Jean d'Angely. If the reporter tells the truth, he must know the purpose. Accordingly, he supplies us with six articles, one of which, however, is not mentioned.⁸ A high ecclesiastic, the Archbishop of Bordeaux, binds himself to grant an unmentioned favor in consideration of Philip's influence in obtaining for him the tiara. I cannot at this stage of a paper in which much remains to be said examine the circumstances which would, if true—and I have no reason to doubt them—disprove the alleged meeting and, of course, the treaty. I allow myself to say this, the report rests only on the authority of Villani, and he had as much means of knowing the antecedents of the meeting as he would have of knowing what took place in secret between the unattended King and Pontiff. Was he a thirdsman at the conference?

I think the general lines of examination have been stated, and I may say Philip's policy does not emerge from the Templars' advocates, beginning with Voltaire, or, if you like, with the Eagle of Meaux. It would be unreasonable to expect that philosophers of the Panama Canal school, the Wilson-Grevy sale of public offices school,

⁸ It was to be declared after De Goth's election. The undisclosed article was said to be the suppression of the order. Within the last few days M. Briand has appropriated the £20,000,000 that had been offered to the non-existent worship associations for old age pensions, hospitals, etc. I can only predict that Panama Canal morality will divert the cup from the lip of old age, which will be fed on high sentiments instead. The pensioner can say with good Peter Teazle: "D—— your fine sentiments!"

the spoliator of a foreign embassy school, could defend Philip for a policy the precedent of their own. Because the Templars are regarded, or pretended to be regarded, as the early form of the Freemasons, it would be too candid to do this; but had they done so, theirs would be the line I intend to take, but with a different purpose, and to which I have been leading up. In a word, the enslavement of the Church was Philip's object, as it is now the object of the Freemasons in France.

Before entering more minutely on what I conceive to be Philip's policy I will report a few of the cases, two English cases and a French contribution, of evidence in the form of a deposition from Vercelli. They are not unfairly representative of the class of evidence distinct from the confessions made under torture, the dread of it or the testimony of renegades, or members who had been expelled for crime. I would trust a confession under torture or fear as little as the testimony of a renegade or spy.

I take the report of William, vicar of St. Clement in Sandwich, before the commission in London. William had heard fifteen years before his examination from a groom in his service that the latter had heard from a servant of a Templar that the servant hid himself under a seat in the great hall of the Preceptory of Dinelee, where the Knights held their midnight chapters. The president preached to the Knights how they might become richer.⁹ The brethren deposited their girdles in a certain place; one of the girdles the servant found and carried to his master, whereupon the latter struck him with his sword in the groom's presence. The vicar was asked if the groom was alive. He answered he did not know. Why did not the vicar tell the story, such as it was, fifteen years before? Either there was no such story or he disbelieved it.

I pause to point out that the investigation began in Paris in October, 1307; that Philip had previously communicated his desire to the princes of Europe that the order should be suppressed on account of enormous crimes, and he was particularly confident of the readiness of his son-in-law, Edward II. of England, to sustain him. I premise that the notes of the processes in France were sent regularly to Edward. There is very distinct proof of this fact, for English evidence was controlled in some cases by the notes or copies of depositions from France.¹⁰

⁹ In what language? The knights only spoke French among themselves. Hyden's "Polychronicon" is my authority, written about 1357. The servant could not have understood the sermon.

¹⁰ Two French cases to contradict English accounts of initiation were put in. This is a serious matter, because the knights in question were received in England. No one believes foul practices were proved concerning English initiations. This is not all.

The communication of Squino di Florian, prior of Montfenleon, in the county of Toulouse, which crystallized into a coherent and formal state paper all the scandals that had been floating in society and among the humbler classes for some time, was made before September. That Edward II. and his ministers were immediately informed of di Florian's accusation is in the highest degree probable, and that without the circumstance that it had been made in the royal prison to which di Florian had been consigned for life as a heretic and profligate.

It is not yet known what the secret article was; therefore there was no secret article. It is the fatuity of invention to think men of sense would believe that Philip would have kept the secret from his Ministers and his brothers, particularly Charles of Valois.

The proceedings did not begin in England until October of 1309 and continued for over three years. Witnesses such as the vicar of Sandwich, recalling the ancient history told them by persons who had heard the details from others, had ample time to cook up these stories or to concoct stories of their own.

I am not just now insisting on the utter absurdity of receiving such a rigmarole as evidence. I can make allowance for the very crude notions which prevail as to what might be admitted at a time when ordinarily the jurors who knew the accused personally were not so much judges as witnesses to character.¹¹ The defendant's character was then a matter of supreme consequence, for the finding depended upon it. I submit that a jury knowing a Templar belonging, say to a preceptory in their neighborhood, and knowing that the first informants were di Florian and his fellow-prisoner, the apostate Templar Roffo, and that these had come from jail to swear away the character and life of the man they knew would have little difficulty in acquitting him, even though the oaths of di Florian and Roffo were backed up by the hearsay of the Vicar William of St. Clement and a thousand hearsays of the kind. The character of the man known to his neighbors as of good repute would stand against all the wild fancies and imaginations, the duplicities and malignities of fools and knaves. Even the colorable corroboration of manufactured testimony would be too flimsy to hold the common sense and experience of such jurors captive. The Templars were not even confronted with the witnesses.

I am now to give the second English deposition. I look at it as a fraudulent and manufactured confirmation of William the Vicar's statement, and I trust the inconsistency of it as well as the inherent improbability of the means of knowledge will impress every one as I have been impressed. The corroboration is the testimony of John

¹¹ That was the reason for the local venue.

de Gertia, a Frenchman. He deposes to what he had been told fourteen years before by a woman named Cacococa. She had been informed by Exvalet, the preceptor of London, that a servant of certain Templars had concealed himself in their chapter-house at Dinelee. She lived near some elms in a suburban street leading to St. Giles. I suggest that the street and suburb must have had names, and as London was then a small place, a resident should know the name of every street and suburb.

Exvalet as preceptor of London was a man of high social position, and the only way in which it could be conceived that he communicated a dreadful secret of his order to a woman living in an unnamed suburb is that she kept a bad house which he frequented. The preceptor of London, according to de Gertia's story, told this woman that after the chapter at Dinelee the hidden servant saw the knights go to an adjacent house, in a room of which they opened a coffer, from which they drew a black idol with shining eyes, performing as they took it forth disgusting ceremonies. One of them refused after a little to continue his part in the ceremonies. He was thrown into a well and the abominable excesses went on as though the murder was a matter of course.

This hideous story bears the marks and tokens of the putting together of the rumors and imaginations going the rounds. The two years or more since the proceedings began in France afforded ample time for legal elaboration into acts of evidence. The case I referred to from France is a magical tale of a character so loathsome that I can only refer to it vaguely. It is a history of the birth of the magic head from the abuse of a disinterred body by a lord of Sidon who had loved the owner in her lifetime. This head was a talisman for good fortune to the order and was worshiped as the deity that secured success.

As the testimony of William the Vicar, the hearsay of hearsay is a fair sample of all the external evidence, I may say a word about it. If it could for a moment be allowed that a clergyman might without censure keep to himself a scandal of a kind so flagrant in its suggestions and so appalling in its main incidents, it would be on the ground that William's charity forbade him to give it currency, or else on the more intelligible ground that he dreaded the vengeance of an organization so wealthy and so powerful as the Templars. He had a Bishop to whom he could communicate the information under a pledge of screening him as the medium. But the inherent improbability is enough to condemn the statement. Assuming the reality of the midnight chapters of abomination, the spy went with his life in his hands. To be acquainted with the secrets, according to the various accounts, meant death, even to such

members of the order as did not approve of the deeds, and, a fortiori, it would mean it to possible spies and informers from outside. The giving up of the girdle would reveal the servant's presence or suggest it, or at least suggest enough for unscrupulous self-defense to get rid of him, and with him to get rid of the groom who saw the blow and must be reasonably suspected to know what the girdle meant or to have been afterwards told why the blow was given.

With regard to the discrepancies between William's story and de Gertia's confirmation of it, I see the clearest evidence of an elaboration, cunning and malignant indeed, but ambitious in its progressiveness of infamy. William heard the particulars fifteen years before. This date suggested the time—fourteen years—for de Gertia's later communication. The interval of twelve months since those behind William, or William himself, just caught hold of the Dinelee mystery, and the entrance of de Gertia on the scene would at once explain the growth of detail.

We have this kind of thing in the history of informers from the time of Tiberius to the latest state trials in Ireland. The growth of particulars in the "Popish Plot" was so momentous that when men came to their senses they saw what liars Oates, Dangerfield, Ludlow and the other vile creatures were, who added new things to accounts of their means of knowledge, new things to the extent, means and designs of the plotters. As they went on, adherents not named at previous stages were included until men of rank who feared the political wire-pullers like Shaftesbury behind the witnesses realized that their own Protestantism would not save them. It was easy to say that it was a cloak to cover their designs to bring over the Pope and the French King's armies; when the slightest suggestion from the bench as a test of a particular statement would cause the Doctor—as Oates was called—to shout in his peculiar intonation and unparalleled insolence that "may loard was stafline the Ploat." The Doctor, just fancy!

The precision and enlargement of de Gertia's narrative remind me of the growing comprehensiveness and at the same time the increasing argumentative fitness of detail with the Doctor and his satellites. Still, we have this obstacle to belief in both forms of the Dinelee story—namely, how from his secret place the servant could have seen and heard so well? With regard to the later cast of it, how could he see the entry of the adjacent house? We must, at least, suppose two outer walls, two inner walls, a well in the courtyard, a passage and a turn. The eyes that could see through all these from under a seat, and see through the crowds standing around the coffer all that the servant saw must have had a power of vision such as Sam Weller confesses he lacked. As to Cacococa's house,

the vagueness of locality must have had its object. It would have been easy to find it at a time when the great house of the Temple was the western boundary of the city, and cmfwyp itself was in the heart of open spaces. Apart from this, the hideous story told by this woman, whose name suggests de Gertia's imagination or else a shameless notoriety—altogether a maze of baseness and depravity active in conspiracy, I say this hideous story shows what little reliance can be placed on the proceedings, can be placed on the findings of the various commissions, when one thinks of the origin of the magic head as testified, and that a document containing statements of the time loathsome, bewildering, portentous and incredible, coming from distant Vercelli, would be accepted as part of the acts of indictment and put upon the record.¹²

At the same time, a belief in magic prevailed, and according to the notions of the period evidence of magical acts was not merely legal, but would be the most material proof in prosecutions for their employment. Investigations in natural science, experiments in the laboratory were not safely employed even by monks. Three centuries before Silvester II. won an evil name as a pursuer of unlawful studies. It was said of this great scholar: "*Homagium diabolo fecit et male finivit*," alluding to his death by poison at the hands of the "white devil" who had poisoned Otho III. Marlowe calls in one of his plays such women "white devils."

The fact is that an accusation of the kind was the same as a conviction. It was used to get rid of a political opponent. We find it employed to destroy the influence of the most popular prince of the House of Lancaster a century and a half later than the process against the Templars. Such charges were easily made and were met with the greatest difficulty. An accusation of the sort meant that the impeached person had sold himself to the Evil Principle, and by the compact had acquired power over the forces of nature. That from his malignity calamities visited the nations; from his laboratory went forth a spell upon the earth which made it sterile; at his bidding the stars shed fatal influences, the skies refused their rains or sent tempests against church and tower and town that laid them in ruins.

The prominence of such an accusation against the Templars sprang from those astute lawyers, de Nogaret and de Plasian, who advised Philip throughout. As men versed in the passions and prejudices, possessing power over their contemporaries, they calculated on depriving the impeached order of the sympathy of all classes. There was a subtlety in the selection of such an article,

¹² There was a head in every Preceptory—gold, two-faced, so on. Not one was found, despite the descent on the French ones, sudden as a thunder-clap.

for it would go into the public heart and mind that a magician, a sorcerer, a necromancer, with the devil as his agent, his servant for the covenanted time to rule the powers of nature and the mysteries of the grave, would be capable of any crime. What were the abominations of the secret midnight chapters in comparison to calling up the dead, to reveal the hidden things of the past, foretell the future and show as in a mirror the secret sins of friend and foe? What in comparison were those nameless enormities to the power to send pestilence whose march was more deadly than that of destroying armies?

Yet we find an article accusing the knights of refusing to pay taxes to the King, and that among the most conspicuous items of impeachment they relied upon the Papal exemption; and this justification was probably a greater offense than the refusal. But the fact of its being included in the leading counts is to me a proof that Philip and his Ministers really did not believe in the order's guilt beyond the diplomatic pretense of covering them with infamy. The point suggested is that these abandoned men, enemies of God and portents of wickedness, claimed, as servants of God, exemption from the taxes which even the poorest paid. The effect is obvious.

Altogether the question of guilt is one of great difficulty. It is not the less so from the fact that the only valid evidence is the confessions; but these were for the most part obtained by torture under conditions of exceptional cruelty. The admissions of the seventy-two, said to be voluntarily made before the Holy Father himself at the end of the inquiries in France, have been accepted as conclusive by writers who condemn the order. The torture inflicted on so many and the winding up of the torture by the fires in which they died, may have had an effect on the survivors, who are said to have voluntarily confessed their guilt. This one cannot determine, but I submit that a little daylight comes in when we look at one or two circumstances in the confessions.

It would seem proved that the charge of spitting on the crucifix had at least a qualified sanction when the aspirant came to be initiated. It is avowed almost in every confession, but it is palliated by the plea that the applicant always spat above or below the figure, and not upon it. The excuse proves the fact, and is only a plea in mitigation. I don't discredit the plea; I think it is what a person entering the order without any knowledge of such an impious requirement would do if asked by those he thought had some privilege to empower them in exacting the requirement. Such an acknowledgment running through so great a number of confessions satisfies me as to the existence of the practice at initiations, whatever may have been its meaning or origin.

Then there is the denial of Christ. The like argument holds, for the confessions are most numerous and qualified in a similar manner. Those admitting say they denied Him with their lips and not in their hearts. This is like not spitting on the crucifix, but above or below it, and probably the explanation or one of the explanations for this rite at initiations is that it was a test of their fidelity if they should afterward fall into the hands of the Saracens.¹³ It is supposed that if they would endure the punishment to be inflicted for disobedience in this matter they would be faithful in the teeth of infidels. On the other hand, if they obeyed blindly, it was proof of such a surrender of the will as afforded a guaranty that they would dare all things on the field at the command of the Grand Master, and all things that might befall them if vanquished—long imprisonment, the axe of the headsman, death by starvation.

It is unnecessary to say that even to the last moment the Templars in Asia showed fidelity to their faith and the valor of their best days. It was their rule never to flee from an encounter—one of them against three foes—and another rule of theirs was to lead the van and to cover the retreat. At the hour when the sun was setting on the Christian possessions in Asia by the fall of Ptolemais, their loyalty to faith proved itself, for all of them, to the number of six hundred, bowed their necks to the headsman rather than apostatize. In the two matters I have taken as proved—the spitting on the crucifix and the denial of our Lord—I am inclined to accept their explanations that they were not meant as a real contempt, a real repudiation, but outsiders would naturally and properly put the severest interpretation on the practice.

But their doom was sealed. Philip, as I have said, carried his people with him by raising the most popular issue that could be selected within the scope of national politics—namely, the independence of the State from foreign dictation. There were elements of the greatest force in his appeal, owing to the circumstances of the time. One was the confiscation of the boundless wealth of the order, which would supply a treasury only drawing resources by the exercise of extreme cruelties from a people burdened beyond bearing. There was this element—that these men were a menace to the existence of the monarchy, the liberty of France, by their numbers, their discipline and their fortresses in every part of the country.

Those astute and ambitious lawyers, La Flotte, de Nogaret and de Plasian, had been revolving these things for years. The Templars had proved their devotion to the Holy See by refusing to join Philip

¹³ Those who refused were said to be sent over seas immediately and subjected to great severities and humiliations. Despite their own, they could leave the order. We know from the confessions that knights were expelled for crimes. Then the order must not have feared disclosures.

in his movement to degrade Boniface VIII. La Flotte was dead when the proceedings against the Templars began, but his colleagues, and with them a band of court lawyers, who made the precedents for all attempts in later times to subjugate the Church to the monarchy, were able to continue his counsels.

I must conclude I should have liked to discuss Hammer's extraordinary inferences from grotesque sculptures on temple churches in Central Europe—in Bohemia, Austria and Hungary, for instance. Though Hallam allows them force, I can see in them only that eccentricity of fancy which ran riot in the minds of mediæval church architects and masons. The masons were really artists who carved and moulded each stone they put into the building which was to be the house of God. Hammer finds in such adornments evidence of Gnosticism, Ophitism and the like,¹⁴ and as many of the knights were accused of participation in such cults, these would appear a sort of confirmation. It would be the conclusion to capture the Modernist or emancipated sciolist, unless indeed he feared he might acquit the Pope of base subserviency to Philip. Rather than do that the Modernist or vague-headed pursuer of novelty would withdraw Hammer as an ass. No doubt there were in Eastern Europe, here and there, scattered fragments of the believers in these cults, who either had found their way thither from Asia or who were descendants in the Byzantine Empire of infidels or heretics of the first century, who had transmitted their ideas and errors through the vicissitudes of centuries to Eastern Europe, to recesses in the Alps, to that region called Languedoc, where amatory poetry luscious as Catullus' was the moral and intellectual recreation of the fine lady to whom the *trouveur* sang in the castle bower, the incitement of the peasant girl's fancies, to whom the wandering minstrel touched his rote as payment for the hospitality of the night.¹⁵

I should have liked to deal with the alleged treaty which bound Clement to Philip. There are facts that prove that the meeting could

¹⁴ I have seen on the door pillars of Clonmacnoise serpent shapes moulded with exquisite skill. In truth, the delicacy and grace of the lines seemed to indicate the loving care of a devotee. Yet no one fit to remain ten minutes outside a lunatic asylum would have made a charge of Ophitism against the abbots and their monks.

¹⁵ In Ireland thirty brothers were examined and admitted nothing; a chaplain admitted only suspicions. The Franciscans, hostile to malignity, only suspected the order or believed it guilty. No fact. In Scotland the monks or clergy are pretty hard on the knights for their "*conquestus injustos.*" *Indifferenter sibi appropriare cupiunt perfas et nefas, bona et prædia suorum vicinorum.* Naturally this would be worse than all other things to Scotchmen. There can be no doubt but that torture was used in England, but not to the awful lengths it was carried in France. And this justifies my disbelief regarding the extorted confessions. One knight in France exclaimed he would admit the murder of Christ by his own hand if asked.

not have taken place. There are in this story itself circumstances which even if a meeting did take place would compel the judgment of common sense to reject it. It seems to me that the articles are suggested, plainly suggested, by events subsequent to the date of the alleged treaty. In other words, certain events occurred; they suggested the treaty, and the treaty explains them. The romantic idea of a meeting in a wood, as though the King and the Archbishop of Bordeaux could not meet in palace or castle! But they wanted to be where no one could hear, for walls proverbially have ears. But then how did Villani hear? I should have liked to show that this story does not hold water, but I have already passed the limit.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

CHURCH AND STATE IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

SAINT MARTIN AND MAXIMUS.

THE same quarter of a century (375-400) which saw the momentous developments in the relations of Church and State previously noted witnessed a crisis of no less importance in regard to the second of the two leading questions of church history—the manner of dealing with those Christians who refuse to accept the official teaching of the Church of Christ on one or more essential points. Looking at the matter a priori one might be inclined to suppose that the assurance of Our Lord to the effect that the Holy Ghost would always remain with His Church would prevent Christians from carrying differences of opinion in questions of faith and morals to the extremes of heresy and schism. Yet the career of St. Paul alone shows sufficiently well that no human authority, no matter how clear its title to govern, may count, under all circumstances, on obedience to its mandates. Such being the general principle taught by history, it is not surprising to find that in the infant Church there were dissentients in considerable numbers, who preferred their own opinions to the decisions of the official preachers of the Gospel. There must be heresies, the Apostle sadly admitted, but, on the other hand, it was incumbent on the Church to protect herself from the danger to her organization from this source, which was done by depriving heretics of Communion.

In the conditions of the age before Constantine such deprivation of membership was necessarily the only form of punishment that the Church could decree against heretics and schismatics. The question of external coercion was not, therefore, during this period,

as far as Christian dissentients were concerned, in any sense a practical issue. But as regards the general question of religious toleration at this time the few Christian writers who discuss the subject regard freedom of worship as the inalienable right of every human being. Tertullian, for instance, esteems it "a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions," and he further maintains that "it is assuredly no part of religion to compel religion, to which free will, not force, should lead us."¹ Origen and St. Cyprian also regard the prescriptions of the Old Testament relative to the punishment of certain violations of the law as abrogated.² In the age of Constantine Lactantius pronounces as strongly against physical coercion as Tertullian himself. Religion, he holds, "cannot be imposed by force. . . . Nor is it possible for truth to be united with violence, or justice with cruelty." Furthermore, "religion is to be defended, not by putting to death, but by dying; not by cruelty, but by patient endurance. . . . For nothing is so much a matter of free-will as religion."³

These Christian writers have the honor of being the first advocates of religious toleration. For paganism, in all its forms, was essentially intolerant. Indeed, paganism was necessarily intolerant, since dissent from the national religion was universally regarded as high treason. Renouncing the national gods was equivalent to renouncing one's citizenship. Even Plato, in his ideal republic, would not tolerate dissentients from the established religion, whom he stigmatizes as "impious." Heretics who would remain quiet and make no effort to propagate their views, he would treat with comparative mildness by shutting them up in prison for a term of five years, each day of which they would be compelled to listen to a discourse with a view to their conversion. But the violent and the propagandists he would imprison for life and deny them burial after death.⁴

What the Romans of the empire thought on the subject of toleration is sufficiently indicated by their treatment of the Christians, whose dissent from the forms of religion recognized by law was the principal cause of the persecutions of the first three centuries. Constantine and Licinius, in the Edict of Milan, were the first civil rulers to proclaim the broadest doctrine of toleration, and by so doing departed from one of the most respected traditions of the empire they governed. Once a Christian, indeed, the former of these Emperors made no secret of his wish that all his subjects should follow his

¹ *Ad Scapulam*, c. 2.

² *Cf. Vacandard, L'Inquisition*, p. 3, sq.

³ *Lactantius, Div. Inst.*, v. 20.

⁴ *Cf. Boissier, La Fin du Paganisme*, I., 47, sq.

example in embracing the faith. The greatest ambition of his life, he himself tells us, was "to bring the diverse judgments formed by all nations respecting the deity to a condition, as it were, of settled uniformity."⁵ From Constantine's point of view the conversion of his subjects ought to be a very simple matter. Nobody was any longer enthusiastic about the State divinities. As a religious force paganism was dead; whereas, on the other hand, Christianity had long been under trial, and had not been found wanting. The general acceptance of the Christian religion, moreover, would be the salvation of the empire, for Christianity possessed at the same time a rational basis of faith in a Supreme Being to whom all are responsible, and a moral code which, if earnestly practiced, would restore virility to the enervated populace. The difficulties in the way of wholesale conversion, also, seemed the reverse of insuperable. For the prestige of a Christian Emperor, victorious over all his pagan competitors, in other words, victorious over the old-time gods, ought to prove almost a decisive factor in achieving Constantine's purpose. Then, too, the Emperor was Pontifex Maximus, supreme head of the State religion, a fact which made it seem improbable that many would hesitate to act in accordance with his wishes. Yet time was to prove that all pagans were not so ready to renounce the gods as Constantine had hoped; and, worse still, time was further to convince the disappointed Emperor that the Christians were far from being united among themselves. Under these circumstances the temptation to employ some form of coercion in the interest of religious conformity was more than a Roman Emperor could withstand. How Constantine and his successors yielded to the temptation, so far as regarded those who dissented from the imperial form of Christianity for the time being, we have seen in previous papers. From the standpoint of that age, indeed, the employment of a certain degree of force to secure uniformity of religious belief was wholly justifiable. It was an accepted maxim of the imperial government, which nobody thought of questioning, that the preservation of order in society would be impossible, in the highest sense, unless all citizens professed the same faith.⁶ This being the general conviction, no one but the victims thought of denying the right of the Emperor to use the means his office placed at his disposal to bring about the uniformity believed to be necessary for the best government of the empire. The author of the Edict of Milan, therefore, when he closed the pagan temples and abolished pagan sacrifices, in the latter part of his reign, was merely acting conformably with a generally accepted principle.⁷ His Christian successors followed the precedent

⁵ Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, II., 65.

⁶ Boissier, *op. cit.*, 59.

⁷ *Vita Const.*, II., 45.

thus established of proscribing paganism, and laws of increasing severity were from time to time enacted with a view to the extinction of the religion of ancient Rome. These enactments, however, were never very strictly enforced, and all through the fourth century pagans occupied some of the highest offices in the State. The real cause of the gradual decay of paganism was the withdrawal of the imperial favor.

It was, of course, to be expected that the Christians of the empire would waste little sympathy on the hardships of those who remained faithful to the gods, but it was quite another matter when one or other of the groups of Christians created by the doctrinal or disciplinary issues of the time became itself the subject of imperial restrictions. Then, as we have seen, each proscribed party protested in vigorous terms. Yet during the greater part of the fourth century the imperial laws against dissent, though often stringent, all stopped short of exacting the extreme penalty of death. The doubtful credit of establishing a new precedent in this respect was reserved for Maximus, the successful contestant for imperial honors in the West against the Emperor Gratian.

The circumstances responsible for this departure were as follows: About the beginning of the reign of Gratian an ascetical movement, directed by a wealthy layman of considerable mental attainments named Priscillian, began to attract attention in the western part of Spain.⁸ The new sectaries, who placed the apocrypha on a footing of equality with the canonical Scriptures, held opinions on the subject of marriage seriously unorthodox, and their views on the use of wine would have pleased the most rabid modern prohibitionist. In their conduct the element of spiritual pride was much in evidence. Christians not of their way of thinking they looked upon with contempt. They were accused of holding secret meetings; they fasted on Sundays and had a predilection for going about barefooted. When they attended the celebration of the liturgy also it was remarked that they did not receive Holy Communion. Women were especially attracted by the unauthorized spiritual director of the sect, Priscillian, who, though a layman, presumed to introduce doctrines and practices at variance with the official doctrines of the Church. According to Sulpicius Severus,⁹ an Egyptian Gnostic named Marcus was responsible for the introduction into Spain of this "deadly superstition." Marcus had found enthusiastic disciples in a "certain Agape, a woman of no mean origin, and a rhetorician named Helpidius," who in turn made an important conquest in the conversion of Priscillian. The eloquence of Priscillian quickly pop-

⁸ On the Priscillianist movement, *cf.* Leclercq, *L'Espagne Chrétienne*, c. 3, and Duchesne, *Hist. Anc. de l'Eglise*, II, c. 15.

⁹ *Hist. Sacra.*, II, 46.

ularized the movement, so that even two Bishops, Instantius and Salvianus, became his oathbound followers.

Matters had reached this point when Hyginus, Bishop of Cordova, alarmed at the danger, invoked the intervention of his metropolitan, Ydacius of Merida. But, strange to say, Hyginus himself subsequently fell under the influence of the ascetics and admitted them to communion. Ydacius, however, lost no time in making investigations, but his zeal so outran discretion that the measures he thought proper to take against the episcopal adherents of Priscillian only served as "a torch to the growing conflagration." Pope Damasus, whom he consulted on the troubles in his province, advised him to act with moderation, and in particular warned him against pronouncing sentence against any of the accused without hearing their defense. This advice was followed, perhaps too closely, by the council, at which two Gallic Bishops assisted, held at Saragossa in 380. The canons adopted condemned in general the extravagant doctrines of the new sect, but without mentioning by name any individuals.

The fact that their opinions were thus only censured in a vague manner encouraged the sectaries to renew their propaganda with greater boldness than ever. The see of Avila having become vacant, they were strong enough to elect Priscillian to its episcopal throne. Then assuming a pronouncedly aggressive attitude, the heretics declared war on the enemy by preferring grave charges against the chief of their opponents, Bishop Ydacius. At this stage Ydacius and his chief lieutenant, Ithacius, Bishop of Ossonova, adopting "unwise counsels," as Sulpicius Severus regards them, "applied to secular judges that by their decrees and persecutions the heretics might be expelled from the cities."¹⁰ In other words, the Emperor Gratian, at the request of Ydacius, issued a rescript against the Priscillianists, "in virtue of which all heretics were enjoined not only to leave all churches or cities, but to be driven forth beyond all the territory under his jurisdiction." This severe measure was for the moment effective; the Priscillianist Bishops ceased their propaganda and their followers dispersed.

But they had no intention of abandoning the contest with the Catholics. Their three leaders, Priscillian, Salvianus and Instantius, at once set for the imperial court at Milan, where they received but a cool reception from the Emperor and St. Ambrose. Thence they proceeded to Rome, but Pope Damasus refused even to grant them an interview. After the death of one of the trio—Salvianus—in Rome, Priscillian and his remaining companions returned to Milan and again laid their case before Gratian. Their perseverance was

¹⁰ Sulp. Sever., *op. cit.*, II., 47.

now rewarded with complete success. Through the imperial Master of Offices, Macedonius, whom they won by bribery, they obtained a revocation of the existing rescript against them, as well as an order that their churches should be restored to the Bishops of the party.

The victorious Priscillianists once more, on their return to Spain, assumed the aggressive. The most active of their opponents, Ithacius, was the first object of their attack. They accused him before the Proconsul Volventius of being "a disturber of the churches," and he escaped condemnation only by flight into Gaul. In Gaul the fugitive interested the Prefect Gregory in his favor, and this high official issued orders for all parties to the dispute to appear before his tribunal. But again the Priscillianists proved too many for their adversaries. By means of another bribe they obtained an order from their court friend, Macedonius, transferring the case to the jurisdiction of the Vicar of Spain.

The arrest of Ithacius was then attempted, but without success, and the Bishop of Ossonova was able to conceal his whereabouts from his enemies until the victory of Maximus and the subsequent death of Gratian completely reversed the positions of the respective parties.

For Ithacius experienced no difficulty in interesting Maximus favorably in the cause for which he stood. Orders were issued by the new Emperor to the Prefect of Gaul and the Vicar of Spain enjoining them to see that the leaders of the Spanish heretics appear for judgment before an ecclesiastical synod to be held at Bordeaux. The synod met in the year 385. Instantius was the first of the accused cited to defend his doctrines before the fathers, but failing to satisfy them as to his orthodoxy, he was deposed from his bishopric. Priscillian was next called, but, possibly in the hope of securing friends at the court of Maximus by the same means he had employed at the court of Gratian, he appealed from the synod to the Emperor.

Accused and accusers now proceeded to Trier, where Priscillian was speedily brought to realize the mistake he had made in appealing from an ecclesiastical to a civil tribunal. For at the court of Trier Ydacius and Ithacius had things pretty much their own way. These two Bishops, though justified in their defense of the faith against a dangerous heresy, were yet far from being ideal champions of orthodoxy. Sulpicius Severus says that accusers and accused were about equally distasteful to him. Ithacius in particular he characterizes as "a bold, loquacious, impudent and extravagant man," excessively devoted to the pleasures of the table. Ithacius hated asceticism in any form, and "proceeded to such a pitch of folly as to charge all those men, however holy, who either took delight in

reading or made it their object to vie with each other in the practice of fasting, with being friends of Priscillian." His prejudice against austerities carried him so far as to accuse of heresy even St. Martin of Tours, solely on the ground of the famous Bishop's predilection for asceticism.

St. Martin was quite a different type of defender of the faith from that represented by Bishop Ithacius. A native of Pannonia and son of an officer of the Roman army, the future Bishop of Tours began his career as a soldier. Although both his parents were pagans, Martin became a catechumen at the age of twelve. About the year 341 he withdrew from the army and embraced the ascetical life in the vicinity of Poitiers, of whose Bishop, St. Hilary, he was an ardent follower. From Poitiers he made a special journey to his native place for the purpose of converting his parents, and was successful in convincing his mother, though not his father, of the divinity of the Christian religion. After the return of St. Hilary from his exile in the East, Martin again established himself near the episcopal city of his patron, where he founded the first of Western monasteries at Liguge. The sanctity of the monastic brethren soon won general admiration, which was reflected in a particular manner on the founder of the institution. Thus it turned out that when in 373 the church of Tours lost its Bishop, Martin was drawn by a ruse from his monastic seclusion and, in spite of his protestations, elected by acclamation Bishop of the vacant see. The Bishops present on the occasion were not all quite so enthusiastic as the people, and it was with some reluctance that at least one of their number finally gave his assent to the popular choice.

Martin proved, needless to say, a model Bishop. Early in his new career he took up his abode in the new monastery of Marmoutier, which he established in the vicinity of Tours, and there organized a vigorous campaign, which proved eminently successful, against paganism in the rural districts of his diocese. When his eloquence, as occasionally happened, failed to persuade the pagan populations that they should themselves destroy the sanctuaries of the gods, the Bishop undertook the task of demolition, sometimes at no small risk to his life. Then on the site of the pagan temples he erected churches or monasteries, which thus became centres for the evangelization of the adjoining districts. The great success he achieved by degrees won for Martin a national fame, and thus we find him at the accession of Maximus by all odds the greatest Bishop of Gaul.

Such was the man whom the epicurean Bishop of Ossanova dared stigmatize as a heretic. Like the court Bishops of the East during the previous half a century, Ithacius had no proper conception of the meaning of the Christian religion, and he regarded his episcopal

office rather as a means of temporal than of spiritual advancement. As St. Martin represented so very different a type of churchman, Ithacius instinctively disliked the Bishop of Tours, but he was soon to have still greater reason, from his point of view, for hostility to the saint, whom he found a determined opponent of his own policy with regard to the Priscillianists.

By the time St. Martin first appeared upon the scene Ithacius had determined that the leaders of the heretics should be judged by a civil tribunal, and punished with death. The mere notion of such a procedure profoundly shocked the Bishop of Tours, who vainly besought Ithacius to abandon his intention. On the question at issue St. Martin's opinion was as clear as it was moderate. Those accused of heresy, he maintained, should, in the first place, be judged only by Bishops, and, in the second place, if found guilty, they should be punished only with excommunication. He regarded it as "a foul and unheard-of indignity that a secular ruler should be judge in an ecclesiastical cause."¹¹ Failing to move Ithacius, he remonstrated with the Emperor and, as he thought, successfully, since Maximus assured him that no blood would be shed. But no sooner had Martin left Trier than the Bishops again importuned Maximus, who at length, yielding to the persuasions of two of their number, Magnus and Rufus, gave orders for the accused to appear for trial before the Prefect Evodius. Priscillian made some damaging admissions relative to the peculiar practices of his sect, and he was convicted of the principal charge made against him, that of *maleficium*. Under the civil law this was a capital crime, hence the offender was sentenced to death. For some reason or other the trial had to be repeated, and this time, complacent as they had been previously, the Bishops insisted that Ithacius should not appear as accuser. This office was entrusted to a treasury official named Patritius, who succeeded in convicting Priscillian and two of his clerical followers, Felicissimus and Armenius. Subsequently the deacons Asarbius and Aurelius, the poet Latronianus and a matron named Euchrotia were convicted, and all seven were executed. Bishop Instantius, who had been convicted of heresy at the synod of Bourdeaux, as well as the rhetorician Tiberianus, escaped with exile to the Scilly Isles.

Satisfied with their achievements, the Bishops who brought about the condemnation of the Priscillianists remained in Trier, basking in the sunshine of the imperial court. After further deliberations on the subject of Priscillianism they determined to eradicate completely the dangerous heresy they had been combating in the manner described, and to this end they persuaded Maximus to send a special

¹¹ Sulp. Sev., *op. cit.*, c. 50.

commission, armed with plenary powers, into Spain, "to search out heretics," who, when found, were to be deprived "of their life or goods." But before the commission had had time to set out the disturbing news was circulated that St. Martin was returning to Trier. Realizing instinctively that the saint would refrain from communion with them, and dreading the consequences of thus being tacitly condemned by one whose prestige was so great, the Ithacians persuaded Maximus to prohibit the Bishop of Tours from entering the city, unless he would first promise to remain on friendly terms with them. The officials charged with this demand encountered Martin approaching Trier, and the saint readily promised that "he would come among them with the peace of Christ." This seemed satisfactory, and Martin was allowed to continue his journey.

In coming to court at this time the saint had several objects in view, among them being that of securing pardon for two former officers of Gratian. His principal purpose was, however, to obtain the revocation of the powers of the commission about to depart for Spain. But this favor Maximus was reluctant to grant. For, in the first place, Martin refused to communicate with the Bishops, and in the next place, the Emperor was credited at the time with a strong desire to lay hands on the confiscated goods of the Spanish heretics.¹² The Bishops, too, begged the Emperor not to fail them, for they knew full well that Martin, whom they were pleased to designate a defender and vindicator of heretics, was supported by public opinion. To a certain extent their efforts were successful, and the Emperor assured them of his continued support. According to Sulpicius Severus, the Ithacians even tried to persuade Maximus to dispose of Martin as he had disposed of Priscillian. Prudence, however, if no better motive, prevented the Emperor from adopting a proposal so outrageous, which in all probability would then and there have cost him his usurped throne. Instead of violent measures, therefore, Maximus determined to try persuasion, and sending for Martin he gave him a plausible account of the condemnation of Priscillian and his followers which he thought ought to satisfy the saint's scruples. The heretics, Maximus assured Martin, were condemned for civil rather than religious offenses, and after a fair trial. There was, consequently, no valid reason why the Bishop of Tours should refrain from communion with his confreres. Furthermore, a synod held a few days previously had absolved Ithacius from all responsibility for the condemnation of the Priscillianists. But this specious argument failed to convince Martin, and the Emperor, leaving him in anger, gave orders for the commission to start immediately for Spain.

¹² Sulp. Sever. Dial., III., 11.

The news of this decision was brought to Martin the same night, and at once he hurried to the palace, where he obtained an immediate audience. To save the heretics from the danger that threatened them the saint capitulated. He would communicate with the Bishops on two conditions—namely, that the powers of the commission should be revoked and that all further proceedings of the kind contemplated against the Priscillianists should be abandoned. The Emperor granted his terms without further parley, and the following day Martin, agreeably with his promise, assisted at the consecration of Felix, the newly elected Bishop of Trier, who personally had had nothing to do with the Priscillianist matter.

Yet the saint's conscience reproached him for even this slight concession, which circumstances forced him to make as the only way of preventing bloodshed. Hurrying away from Trier after the ceremony of consecration, the holy Bishop suffered intensely because of what he regarded as his weakness in communicating with the Ithacians under any conditions. On arriving at the village of Andethanna on his homeward journey, he sat down for a while to reason the matter out, but his conscience would not be satisfied. At this point, says Sulpicius Severus, "an angel stood by him and said: 'Justly, O Martin, do you feel compunction, but you could not otherwise get out of your difficulty. Renew your virtue, resume your courage, lest you not only expose your fame, but your very salvation to damage.' " Thenceforward he kept aloof from the Ithacians, and during the remaining sixteen years of his life he refused to attend ecclesiastical synods.¹³

The best public opinion of the time was with St. Martin of Tours in his noble protest against the execution of the Priscillianists. The pretext for this execution, indeed, was that the sectaries had been found guilty of a crime punishable with death under the civil law, but everybody knew that the real reason for the infliction of capital punishment on the heretics was their unorthodoxy. It is quite true that at this time Christians in general regarded heresy as a grave civil offense, but it is equally true that the great majority of Christians were strongly opposed to the death penalty for religious dissent. St. Martin's opinion as to the proper manner of dealing with heresy is very clearly stated, and his view is substantially that of his contemporaries, St. Ambrose and Pope Siricius. Those accused of teaching false doctrines, St. Martin held, should be judged only by a synod of Bishops, and if found guilty, they should merely be excommunicated and expelled from their churches.¹⁴ The Bishop of Tours did not, therefore, find fault with a certain degree of indirect tem-

¹³ Sulp. Sev., *op. cit.*, c. 13.

¹⁴ Sulp. Sev. *Hist. Sacra.*, II., 50.

poral punishment for heresy, which was obviously a necessity; for otherwise a heretical Bishop could with impunity retain in his possession the churches of his diocese, using them for a purpose the opposite of that for which they were founded. Furthermore, nobody in the fourth century raised any particular objection when the State imposed the penalty of exile on heresiarchs or fomenters of schism; good order, indeed, then ordinarily demanded the removal of personages of these two categories to a distance from the scenes that witnessed their departure from orthodoxy. But prior to the Priscillianist troubles, no group of orthodox Bishops ever countenanced extreme penalties against dissenters. Now that a new precedent was established by Spanish and Gallic Bishops, a precedent which went even farther than any of the palmy days of Constantius and Valens, the leading Bishops of the Western Church expressed their indignation against its authors in a manner that left no room for doubt as to their opinions. St. Ambrose, on his second mission to the court of Trier, refused to have any relations with Bishop Felix, who, because of the peculiar circumstances of his consecration, was necessarily identified with the Ithacians. Pope Siricius demanded explanations of Maximus,¹⁵ which were evidently unsatisfactory, as we infer from the sixth canon of the Council of Turin, held towards the year 400.¹⁶ So long, indeed, as Maximus reigned the Ithacians held their own, but after the defeat and death of their imperial protector their cause was lost. Ydacius of Merida then, of his own accord, resigned his see, and Ithacius was deposed. Ydacius subsequently endeavored again to take possession of his bishopric, but failed in the attempt. History loses sight of him and his friend Ithacius enjoying leisure for reflection on their achievements in a Neapolitan prison.

Thus, at the close of the fourth century, while punishment of greater or less severity inflicted on heretics and schismatics by imperial enactments was generally approved, yet, on the other hand, the Catholics of the empire were practically unanimous in the opinion that such punishment should invariably stop short of death. The Theodocian code contains sixty-eight laws, enacted in a period of fifty-seven years,¹⁷ on the subject of heresy, but of these only one exacts the supreme penalty for heresy. The exception is a law of

¹⁵ P. L., t. XIII., 592.

¹⁶ "Those Bishops of Gaul who have refused communion with Felix of Trier ought to be admitted to the council, conformably with a letter of Ambrose of blessed memory, and of the Pope." In other words, those Bishops who took the side of St. Martin in the Priscillianist matter were alone admitted to the Italian synod, whereas those in any way identified with the Ithacians were excluded.—*Cf.* Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, II., Part I., p. 134.

¹⁷ Loening, *Geschichte des Deutschen Kirchenrechts*, I., 98.

the Emperor Honorius, and its scope is limited to a Manichean sect, against which the pagan Emperor Diocletian had enacted a law of equal severity. Honorius also, it is true, decreed, in a law of 410, that all heretics who assembled for common worship were liable to the death penalty, but this enactment appears to have been intended to intimidate dissidents and induce them by fear of the consequences to return to orthodoxy. The mere fact of being a heretic was not illegal; so long as the individual kept his views to himself he was not interfered with. But any attempt to propagate heresy was ordinarily punished with confiscation and exile.¹⁸

In the early part of the fifth century the question of how to deal with dissidents in large numbers from the officially recognized creed occupied a considerable share of the attention of the Emperor Honorius. For nearly a century prior to this time the Church of Africa had been divided into two bitterly opposed factions, the Donatists and the Catholics. Although the grounds for the Donatist schism were wholly trivial, yet all previous attempts to end it had proved futile. Honorius now determined to employ the strongest measures against the sectaries, with the approval of most of the Catholic hierarchy of the province. At first one African Bishop, St. Augustine, disapproved of the severe enactments of the Emperor. But by degrees the views of the great Bishop of Hippo underwent considerable modification, a fact of very great moment in the history of heresy and schism.

At the beginning of his career as a priest of Hippo St. Augustine determined to do all in his power to terminate a senseless schism which he regarded as a disgrace to the Church of Africa. The means for the attainment of this desirable object which he proposed to adopt were "peaceful conferences," in which the civil authorities should have no part. On the side of the Catholics there should be "no appeal to men's fear of the civil power," and nobody should be compelled "to embrace the communion of any party;" but on the part of the schismatics he required that the violent sect of the Circumcelliones should be kept in order.¹⁹ The discussions thus inaugurated continued for several years with fairly good results, and at length, in 411, by mutual agreement, a great conference of the Bishops of both parties was arranged to be held at Carthage, with an imperial official named Marcellinus as referee.

The conference opened in June, 411, with 286 Catholic and 279 Donatist Bishops participating. At the suggestion of Marcellinus seven Bishops on each side were selected to present the arguments of the respective parties. The decision, given in favor of the Cath-

¹⁸ Cod. Theod., XVI., tit. V., 45.

¹⁹ St. Aug., Ep. XXIII., 6, 7.

olics, was not acceptable to the Donatists, who, as in the reign of Constantine, appealed to the Emperor for final judgment. But Honorius pronounced against them, as did his predecessor, and the Donatists were ordered to surrender their churches to their adversaries.

Severe measures were now decreed against those who persisted in schism. Their churches were ordered to be seized; Donatist Bishops and priests were banished and their material possessions confiscated, while the laity of the sect were punished with greater or less severity according to their status as freemen or slaves.

For several years previous to this culmination St. Augustine's views on the question of the punishment of heresy and schism had been undergoing a gradual change. In the period following immediately on his conversion his tolerance was of the broadest character, embracing even the Manicheans. But little by little he became a convert to the theory of moderate coercion, for reasons which we find stated at length in his ninety-third letter.

Briefly stated, St. Augustine became an advocate of coercion after he had seen coercion successfully employed in bringing back to the Catholic fold a host of schismatics. Curiously enough, also, the converts from schism themselves seem to have been in a large measure responsible for the change of mind in this regard of the Bishop of Hippo. For even the most fanatical of the schismatics, the Circumcelliones themselves, stated freely after their reconciliation that they had long been laboring under a "wretched delusion," "as persons beside themselves," who under the bondage of custom would have continued in their erroneous practices had they not, "under the shock of alarm," addressed themselves with genuine earnestness to the study of the truth. Furthermore, many of these converts to Catholicism now spoke "bitterly of the weight with which their ruinous course formerly oppressed them," and confessed that it was the duty of the Catholics "to inflict annoyance on them, in order to prevent them from perishing under the disease of lethargic habit, as under a fatal sleep." These peculiar views evidently astonished St. Augustine and made him ask himself whether after all his colleagues in the episcopate were not right and he wrong as to the best way of eradicating Donatism. His conclusion was in favor of the employment of the sort of moderate coercion favored by the "fatherly diligence" of the African Bishops. For not every one, he urged, who is indulgent is a friend, nor, on the other hand, is every one an enemy who smites; better are the wounds of a friend than the proffered kisses of an enemy. One who binds a madman or who arouses a slothful neighbor is distasteful to the persons thus disturbed; yet in both instances the friend acts for the best interests

of the irritated parties. Or take the decisive example of God in His dealings with men. Does not our Creator Himself unite salutary fear with wholesome instruction? Some of the patriarchs of the Old Testament suffered from famine; the chosen people for their sins were often and severely punished, and even the Apostle of the nations was afflicted so that his strength might be perfected in weakness. Why, then, not chastise the foolish members of the flock of Christ who refuse unreasonably to accept the shepherd's protection, which is necessary for their salvation? To inflict punishment in a vindictive spirit would be, of course, inexcusable; but punishment of the order in question is merely a means to an end, and the end is that the African schismatics should be compelled to hear salutary instruction. The results so far had been excellent, and the wanderers had been among the first to express their gratitude to the shepherds who by paternal coercion had brought them back to the fold.²⁰

But, it was objected, no one can be compelled to be righteous. To this St. Augustine replies by quoting the injunction of the Lord to the servants at the marriage feast: "Compel them to come in." The degree of compulsion here approved of, however, is still of the paternal order, as is clear from the example of the conversion of St. Paul cited in illustration. The Apostle "was compelled by the great violence with which Christ coerced him to know and embrace the truth." In her dealings with the schismatics similarly, the Church is merely endeavoring to counteract the evil of sin, "not with the hatred which seeks to harm, but with the love which seeks to heal."

The employment of such punishments as exile and fines, therefore, St. Augustine regards as justifiable for the purpose of bringing back to safety those who have been led away by perverse men from the fold of Christ. But the aim of repression and restraint should be the spiritual good of those affected, rather than that they should depart from evil than be punished for crime.²¹ And, as already noted, the results of this policy had proved to the satisfaction of the Bishop of Hippo that his own early views on tolerance were at least partially erroneous. Before his eyes in his episcopal city of Hippo he had a striking example of what the imperial laws against the Donatists had effected. Hippo, which had formerly been a Donatist stronghold, was now wholly Catholic, and this surprising change had been brought about by means of which those who alone had a right to protest heartily approved. St. Augustine entertained no suspicion as to the sincerity of the conversion of his diocesans, who themselves

²⁰ Ep. XCIII., cc. 1, 2.

²¹ Ep. XCIII., 10.

assured him that they had remained in schism either because they had not taken the trouble to ascertain what the merits of the dispute between Catholics and Donatists really were, or because they had been afraid of offending the leaders of their party by returning to the Church.

But while St. Augustine thus became a convert to the principle of compulsion in religion, his writings leave no room for doubt that at all times he was strongly opposed to the infliction of the more severe forms of punishment, and particularly of the death penalty for heresy or schism. In theory, it is true, he admitted that a heretic was a criminal of the worst order, who, as such, deserved the extreme penalty of the law. Heretics, he argued, "kill souls, for which the State inflicts corporal punishment only; they cause eternal death, and yet complain when made to suffer temporal death."²² Yet, in spite of their guilt, and although "every injury done by impious and ungrateful men against Christian society is a more serious and heinous crime than if it had been done against others," nevertheless the civil magistrate should not on this account punish offenses of this order with the severity they deserve, but "with the moderation which is suitable to Christian forbearance."²³ The Church does not desire the death of heretics, but "their deliverance from error." It would be, on the one hand, a mistake to inflict no punishment at all on heretics, since a wholesome fear of temporal suffering may save them from "falling under the penalty of eternal judgment." But neither does the Church wish to see heretics "subjected to the severer punishment which they deserve;" on the contrary, her strongest desire is that "sinners may be spared to repent of their sin."

Wherefore, St. Augustine begs of the Proconsul Donatus, to whom this letter is addressed, when pronouncing judgment in cases affecting the Church, that no matter how wicked the offenders may be, he must try "to forget that he has the power to inflict capital punishment." If the Proconsul will not grant this favor to the Bishop of Hippo, then no Bishop can coöperate with the civil authorities by denouncing heretics; in other words, Bishops approve of the milder forms of punishment for heresy, but they are totally opposed to the supreme penalty being carried out against heretics. Still more emphatic in opposition to extreme measures is a letter of St. Augustine's to Marcellinus, the imperial official who presided over the conference of Carthage. In this letter St. Augustine says that he has heard with the deepest concern of certain crimes committed by the Circumcelliones in the Diocese of Hippo. These crimes con-

²² In Joannem, Tract. XI., c. 15.

²³ Ep. C., 1.

sisted of the murder of the priest Restitutus and the gouging out the eyes and cutting off a finger of another priest, Innocentius. A considerable number of persons had been arrested on the charge of complicity in these grave offenses, and of these several had confessed their guilt. Yet, even in this instance, St. Augustine was opposed to the infliction of capital punishment, and he now writes in haste imploring Marcellinus by his faith in Christ and "by the mercy of Christ Himself, by no means to do this or permit it to be done." He has no objection to ordinary criminals being punished according to law, but he does "not wish to have the sufferings of the servants of God avenged by the infliction of precisely similar injuries in the way of retaliation." He recommends, therefore, that the guilty fanatics shall merely be deprived "of the liberty to commit further crimes." Justice must, indeed, be satisfied, but, just because the crimes of which the Circumcelliones had been convicted were associated with the Christian religion, the Bishop of Hippo strongly urges Marcellinus not to treat them as he would ordinary offenders against the law. Their lives must not be taken nor their bodies in any way maimed; only such coercive measures may be employed as will restrain "their insane frenzy" and compel them "to give up mischievous violence and betake themselves to some useful labor."²⁴ By thus imposing only a moderate penalty for the outrages committed by the guilty schismatics, these will have a further opportunity to repent of their evil deeds, and thus what would ordinarily be regarded as a punishment will not in reality be such at all, since it will have effected the conversion to a better and more Christian frame of mind of the unfortunates whom their advocate regards as scarcely responsible beings.²⁵ "Fulfill, Christian judge," continues St. Augustine, "the duty of an affectionate father; let your indignation against their crime be tempered by considerations of humanity; be not provoked by the atrocity of their sinful deeds to gratify the passion of revenge, but rather be moved by the wounds which these deeds have inflicted on their own souls to exercise a desire to heal them. Do not now lose that fatherly care which you maintained when prosecuting the examination, in doing which you extracted the confession of such horrid crimes, not by stretching them on the rack, not by furrowing their flesh with iron claws, not by scorching them with flames, but by beating them with rods, a mode of correction used by schoolmasters and by parents themselves in chastising children, and often by Bishops in the sentences awarded by them. Do not, therefore, now punish with extreme severity the crimes which you searched out with lenity." If Marcellinus will not listen

²⁴ Ep. CXXXIII., 1.

²⁵ Ep. CXXXIII., 1.

to this advice from Augustine, the friend, let him then hearken thereto as the counsel of Augustine the Bishop, who by virtue of his office in such a matter as this, and speaking to a Christian judge, has the right to command with authority. St. Augustine employs these strong terms because he does not wish to see the sufferings of Catholic servants of God, which ought to be useful in the spiritual upbuilding of the weak, "sullied by the retaliation of injustice on those who did them wrong." As a son of the Church Marcellinus should temper the rigor of justice with clemency, and thus demonstrate his own proper comprehension of the Christian faith.²⁶

In the Eastern Church St. John Chrysostom, in the earlier portion of his career, held views on the subject of toleration as moderate as those of St. Augustine during the period immediately following his conversion. "The wrongdoer," St. Chrysostom maintained, "must be made better, not by force, but by persuasion." Authority to employ restraint against sinners is not given by law, but even if it were given, its exercise would be futile, "inasmuch as God rewards those who abstain from evil by their own choice, not from necessity."²⁷ In common with all his contemporaries, however, St. John had a perfect horror of heresy. The virtues of heretics he regarded as virtues in appearance only,²⁸ and neither he nor any other Christian of that age seriously entertained the idea that a heretic might be in good faith. Propagators of heresy, therefore, were the worst of criminals, and as such should be severely dealt with; but, like St. Augustine, Chrysostom drew the line at capital punishment. The execution of a Christian for the crime of heresy he regards as wholly indefensible; those who approve of such a procedure fail to grasp the plain teaching of Christ as expressed in the parable of the cockle. But our Lord did not forbid the repression of heresy by such means as interdicting heretical reunions and prohibiting heretical propaganda. When, therefore, the priest is unable to convince heretics of their errors, then the secular powers should intervene, in the sense indicated. In this manner the earthly will coöperate with the heavenly kingdom and put an effective check on the obstinacy and pride of the stiff-necked generation of those who set their own opinions above the teaching of the Church.²⁹ A story is told by the historian Socrates which illustrates Chrysostom's idea of the manner in which heresy should be dealt with. At the time John became Bishop of Constantinople the now proscribed Arian sect had still a considerable number of adherents in the Eastern capital. Having

²⁶ Ep. CXXXIII., 3.

²⁷ De Sacerdotio, II., 3; cf. Puech, S. Jean Chrysostome et les Moeurs de son Temps, p. 203.

²⁸ Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

²⁹ Hom. 46, in Matt.; cf. *op. cit.*, p. 205, and Vacandard, L'Inquisition, p. 25.

no churches within the city, the sectaries were accustomed to assemble twice a week, on Saturday and Sunday, in the public squares and near the city gates, where they formed processions and marched, singing hymns, to the place outside the walls where they were still allowed to hold public worship. On their way home at night after services the Arians were usually in an aggressive mood, and loudly proclaimed their defiance of the orthodox by "making use of insulting expressions in relation to the Homoousians." This was too much for the Bishop, who, besides regarding these demonstrations as offensive to Catholics, feared that some of the weaker of his own flock might be contaminated by bad example. He therefore, with the zealous coöperation of the Empress Eudoxia and one of her eunuchs named Briso, organized counter nocturnal demonstrations, which far surpassed in display those of the Arians. The result was what might have been anticipated—violent encounters between the rival demonstrators, which brought about the intervention of the civil authorities. The Arian processions were interdicted, and thus the scandal ended.

The view of heresy and heretics set forth above is that which prevailed in the Western Church down to the thirteenth century. Pope Leo the Great, indeed, has been accused of favoring the infliction of the death penalty for heresy, but an impartial reading of the letter on which this charge is based does not substantiate this indictment. Writing to the Bishop of Asturia in Spain on the errors of the Priscillianists, Pope Leo refutes in detail the doctrines of this sect, as they had been developed by the middle of the fifth century. The Pope regarded this heresy as very bad indeed; it synthetized, he claimed, the worst features of every heresy that had thus far appeared in Christendom, and therefore its continued existence would constitute a serious danger to both Church and State. The Priscillianists, he states, were little, if at all, better than heathens. Their religious doctrines, and especially their peculiar views with regard to demons, were practically a denial of human responsibility. For the logical deduction from their belief was that "no reward will be due for virtues, no punishment for faults and all the injunctions not only of human laws, but of divine constitutions, will be broken down." "No criterion of good or bad actions" will be possible "if a fatal necessity drives the impulses of the mind to either side, and all that men can do is through the agency not of men, but of stars." This being the case, the Pope commends the contemporaries of Priscillian for their efforts towards the extirpation of so fatal a heresy. And "even the leaders of the world," he adds, "so abhorred this profane folly that they laid low its originator, with most of his disciples, by the sword of the public laws. For they saw that all

desire for honorable conduct was removed, all marriage ties undone, and the divine and the human law simultaneously undermined, if it were allowed for men of this kind to live anywhere under such a creed." This rigorous treatment of the Priscillianists was "for long a help to the Church's law of gentleness, which, although it relies upon the priestly judgment and shuns blood-stained vengeance, yet is assisted by the stern decrees of Christian princes, since fear of corporal punishment may be a means of inducing such offenders to seek a spiritual remedy."³⁰

In this portion of his letter referring to the dealings of the civil power with the Priscillianists the Pope's idea is, apparently, that the civil authorities were justified, as the guardians of social order, in condemning to death the leaders of a sect whose teachings would undermine the very foundations of the State. Furthermore, while the State was thus attending to a matter that concerned itself, the punishment which it inflicted on the Priscillianists was indirectly helpful to the Church. The Church's own tribunal would, it is true, have pronounced a milder sentence. Yet for all this, the State's judgment was in strict accordance with the law, which being so, the Church by the enforcement of the law was aided indirectly, though she herself had no responsibility for the execution of the guilty parties. But, as is evident from other references in this Pope's writings, St. Leo did not sanction the death penalty for heresy alone. In a letter to Bishop Julian of Cos, for example, he instructs his representative at the imperial court to confer with the Emperor Marcian on the subject of heresy, which, although it should be repressed, yet in so doing the extreme penalty of death should never be resorted to (*non gladium evaginantes ad necem.*)

Such were the most important developments in the course of the century following the conversion of Constantine in the matter of dealing with heresy. From the earliest Christian times heresy was universally regarded as the most heinous of sins. The heretic, St. Paul instructs Titus, shall be admonished a first and a second time of the grave character of his offense; if he will not heed, he must be avoided by Christians as a man in evident bad faith, who stands self-condemned.³¹ St. John, Eusebius informs us, would not even for a moment voluntarily remain under the same roof as Cerinthus, "the enemy of the truth," fearing lest the mere presence of the heretic would bring instant disaster on the edifice. His disciple, St. Polycarp, was no less severe when he saluted the heretic Marcion as the "first-born of Satan."³² The idea that a heretic might really

³⁰ St. Leo, M., Ep. XV., 1. Dum ad spiritale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium qui timent corporale supplicium.

³¹ Titus, III., 10, 11.

³² Eusebius, H. E. IV., 14.

believe what he taught was entertained by no one; a heretic was a person who deliberately taught a doctrine he knew to be false, in contradiction of the infallible teaching of the Church. Heretics were consequently cut off from all association with the faithful, who must hold no relations with them so long as they obstinately refuse to heed the official remonstrances of the Church authorities. Thus, indirectly, excommunication involved a certain degree of temporal punishment, which in the case of the poor accustomed to receive alms from the Church treasury, may have been of serious moment.³³ But apart from the loss of communion and its consequences no ecclesiastical writer before Constantine entertained the idea of any more serious punishment than this for heresy. The Donatist schismatics were responsible for the introduction of a new precedent when they appealed from the decision of two ecclesiastical courts to the tribunal of the Emperor. Too late they realized their mistake, for Constantine not only decided against them, but ordered their churches to be seized, their leaders exiled and their property confiscated.

Five Arian chiefs were punished with exile, also by this Emperor, because of their refusal to accept the decisions of the Council of Nice, and all who possessed heretical books were ordered to destroy them under penalty of death.³⁴ The Bishops of the council seem, at least tacitly, to have sanctioned this decree of the civil ruler, the first part of which, indeed, signified little more than the enforcement by the Emperor of what was involved in the sentence of excommunication. But in the latter years of Constantine's reign, as well as in the reigns of Constantius and Valens, the orthodox became themselves the victims of the repressive measures adopted by the State for the purpose of compelling the universal assent of Christians to the creeds sanctioned by the civil authorities. Eventually the tide turned again in favor of orthodoxy, in the reigns of Gratian and Theodosius. By this time the principle of a civil sanction for religious dissent was universally accepted by Christians. Yet to the credit of the triumphant Catholics it must be said that they were far more moderate in victory than had been their Arian adversaries. This was especially true of the West, as is evident from the general approval with which the spirited protests of St. Martin of Tours were received. The Emperor Theodosius, indeed, enacted severe laws against heretics, and his successor in the West, Honorius I., prohibited heretical assemblages under pain of death. Yet so far at

³³ Cf. De Cauzons, *Histoire de l'Inquisition en France*, I., 143, sqq., who discusses in a very satisfactory manner the whole question of heresy in the first and second periods of Church history as an introduction to his principal subject.

³⁴ Sozomen, *H. E.* I., 21.

least as concerns Theodosius, Sozomen tells us that his enactments were not at all strictly enforced. "The Emperor had no desire to persecute his subjects; he only wished to enforce uniformity of view about God through the medium of intimidation."³⁵ But whatever may have been the intentions of the civil authorities in their laws against heresy, the unanimous opinion of the greatest Bishops at the end of the fourth and in the early part of the fifth century was that while heretics deserved punishment, this punishment should be of a comparatively mild order. St. Martin stood for excommunication only, with its corollary, the expulsion of heresiarchs from churches in their possession. St. Augustine, while admitting in principle that heresy was the greatest of offenses against Christian society, and as such a capital crime, yet, as is clear from his protests quoted above against extreme severity, he was totally opposed to the infliction of capital punishment even in the case where religious dissent was closely connected with so grave a crime as murder. The reason for this attitude St. Augustine states in his letter to Marcellinus; as a Christian Bishop he could not entertain the idea that the shedding of blood for any offense, however grave, against religion would harmonize with the teachings of Christ. Yet at the same time he maintained that heresy in a Christian State is a capital crime. The future was destined to produce generations of Christians more logical, if less tolerant, than the great Bishop of Hippo.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Harrisburg, Pa.

THE NATURE OF SACRIFICE.

CATHOLIC theologians, in discussing the nature of sacrifice, usually take for granted the definition of this rite as "an oblation or offering of some sensible object to God by man." Differences of opinion between them exist in connection with the mode of offering and the precise ends for which the sacrifice is offered rather than with the fundamental notion. But according to the principles of those essentially modern branches of study, the sciences of anthropology and comparative religion, an entirely new way of regarding the rite has arisen and one that altogether upsets the traditional teaching on the subject, both Catholic and non-Catholic. According to this new theory the notion of offering is practically eliminated and a sacrifice is described simply as a sacred meal or banquet in which gods and men feast together as a sign of their

³⁵ Sozomen, H. E. VII., 12.

friendship and their desire to communicate with one another. Its origin is due to the simple, childlike ideas of primitive man, for whom to join together at a feast was the recognized symbol of amity. Man, being ever prone to translate his religious sentiments into analogies of ordinary life, gave to this purely human custom a religious signification—hence the rite of sacrifice. Most of those, however, who uphold this theory are ready to admit that this conception of a meal shared with the Divine Powers has not been preserved unchanged throughout the history of religion.

With the advance of civilization and the acquisition of personal property the change from the savage to the nomadic stage and from that again to the agricultural stage, a sacrifice gradually came to be regarded as a gift offered by man to the gods, a gift taken from his own property and offered in token of homage and to obtain the favors of heaven. The banquet fell into the background as the gift-idea developed and became more prominent, but it never altogether disappeared and was preserved in certain classes of sacrifice as at least an integral part of the rite.

The "totem theory" of Professor W. R. Smith,¹ at one time enjoying a certain amount of popularity, is not now generally in favor among students of religion, since further research tends to lessen the importance attributed to Totemism as a factor in primitive religion and even to deny it any religious significance whatever, at least in its origin.²

Most people prefer the less complicated theory of a banquet pure and simple, or else explain the sacred character attributed to the victim as the result of its use in the ritual rather than that of a permanent characteristic as in the Totem theory. Dr. L. R. Farnell, in a most interesting article in the *Hibbert Journal*, discusses the mystical and sacramental character of sacrifice in the ancient Greek religion. He believes this to be due to the fact that the victim or oblations by being offered on the altar received a special consecration whereby they were charged with the divine influence and even "possessed" by the deity to whom they were offered. To feast then on the flesh of the sacrificial victim or to eat the sacred cakes presented to the god was to feast on the god himself, or at least to become intimately united with him.³ This theory seems to possess much truth, and in it the element of oblation holds a more important place than in the banquet theory as it has been called. It may also be regarded as, in its own way, a curious foreshadowing of the Holy

¹ "Religion of the Semites," by W. Robertson Smith.

² "Hastings' Dict. of the Bible," Vol. IV., Art. "Sacrifice," pp. 331 and 332; also "The Secret of the Totem," Andrew Lang.

³ *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1904, "Sacrificial Communion in Greek Religion," L. R. Farnell.

Eucharist and as a testimony to the felt need of human nature for a close and real union with the Divinity it worships—a need that can be satisfied in the religion of Christ alone.

Other writers prefer to regard sacrifice as essentially a gift offered to the gods in token of homage, to obtain their favor or avert their wrath. The origin of this custom is, however, placed either in that of offering food and drink to the spirits of the dead (from whom all gods have been evolved) or simply in the notion that the gods, like men, need or are at least refreshed and pleased by the offerings of food and drink set before them by their human subjects.⁴

Theories such as these are all based upon the same assumption—that the early religious ideas of man must necessarily have been of a low material nature, an assumption entirely disregarding any idea of Revelation and one that is not in reality borne out by the evidence of facts. The earliest ideas of man regarding religion, as far as history can show us, are not by any means his poorest. The evolution of religion from fetichism, ghost-worship, totemism and all the other superstitions through which it is supposed to have passed, is an hypothesis in reality lacking in solid foundation. Superstitions such as these are degenerations of religion and not the lower phases through which it has crept up to higher things.⁵ The history of religion in general, apart from revelation, can only be judged by that of religions in particular, and in these, the religions of Israel and of Jesus Christ alone excepted, degeneration, not progress, seems to be the law. The older theories on the nature of sacrifice no doubt depend too much on a priori considerations and too little on those historical and critical. But, on the other hand, modern theories do not seem to be altogether free from this fault. Instead of theory being always dependent upon fact, as science proclaims it should be, the process is often reversed and fact is colored by preconceived theory. No one, in reality, is so dogmatic in his pronouncements, so intolerant in his opinions as the modern critic or man of science. In comparative religion and its sister science, anthropology, this is especially noticeable. Yet it cannot be denied that both these sciences have done much in the way of throwing light on the problems of the history of religion and all connected with it, such, for example, as the subject of the present paper.

The study of sacrifice and its ritual in the various religions of the world is a most valuable means of throwing light on sacrifice in general, and indeed a necessary means if a true idea of its nature

⁴ "Hastings' Dict. of the Bible," Vol. IV., Art. "Sacrifice." "Primitive Culture," Tylor.

⁵ "The Problem of the Old Testament," by J. Orr, D. D. (Bross Library, Vol. III.), p. 496, Note A, to p. 128, "Early Ideas of God;" also, "The Making of Religion," by Andrew Lang, *passim*.

is to be discovered. The marvelous similarity, even in accidentals, in ceremonies and ritual, found in every known religion leads to the hope of discovering the essential idea which expresses itself everywhere in the same or practically the same way. This question, apart from its own immediate interest, can hardly fail to be an important one for Catholic theology.

The Holy Eucharist in all its aspects may be called the theological question of the day. But of these aspects, perhaps the one that demands more direct attention than any other is the sacrificial aspect. To discover precisely what it is in the Mass that constitutes it a sacrifice is the great object of modern theological speculation, and it is clear that to attain this satisfactorily it must first be necessary to discover what the notion of sacrifice itself implies. The unquestionable difficulty of this is no doubt largely due to the complex nature of the rite, which renders it no easy task to obtain a clear all-round view of that which has so many different sides.

Nowadays, among Catholic theologians, theories on this question are mainly reducible to two, commonly known as the "Destruction" and "Oblation" theories. The first represents more or less the teaching of the older theologians, and is found in most manuals of dogmatic theology. The second is practically the outcome of modern thought, the word "modern" being used, not in the sense of "modernist," but simply as opposed to ancient.

This latter theory can, however, quote authorities in its behalf from the past, especially among a certain French school of the seventeenth century, and it relies to a great extent upon the authority of theologians anterior to the time of Vasquez.⁶ The point at issue between these rival theories is whether the destruction of the object offered by means of slaying, burning or any other way is an essential element of sacrifice as such. Both theories agree in regarding sacrifice as fundamentally an offering made by man to God, but they differ greatly when they come to describe the exact nature of this offering, the mode whereby it is offered and the ends for which it is offered. The question is chiefly concerned, in fact, with the "form" of sacrifice, to use scholastic terminology. The "matter," however, ought not to be neglected. It may be that this has not always received the attention it demands, and that this neglect is at least a partial cause of the obscurity in which the whole question is involved. According to the destruction theory, the principal object of sacrifice is to offer worship to God by the recognition of His supreme power over the life and death of His creatures and His power to dispose of all things. By presenting to Him in sacrifice some one of His

⁶ "Manual of Catholic Theology" (Wilhelm & Scannell), Vol. II., Chap. II., par. 209.

creatures either animate or inanimate and destroying it in an appropriate manner, the nothingness of all creation as compared to its Creator and His power to dispose of everything, even life itself, as He wills, is symbolized in a striking way. Hence the essential point in the sacrifice is the slaying or destruction of the object as such—of course, for the symbolical reasons mentioned above.

According to the oblation theory, while destruction in some form is admitted as forming part, and an important part, of sacrificial ritual, this destruction is only the means whereby the end of sacrifice is attained, that end being the handing over and surrender of the oblation to God. The destruction of the offering takes effect as far as man is concerned, but it is thereby all the more effectually given up to the Divine Powers, being now removed entirely from the dominion of its human owner. In this we have but another example of the ultimate inadequacy of all human symbols. To destroy what belonged to him and thus render it useless for his own purposes, was the best way in which man could express his desire to give it up completely to God, since no man can actually approach Him. The essential point of sacrifice, in this view, is not the destruction of the oblation, but the offering of it to God, the entire surrender of it to Him. The slaying is preparatory to the sacrifice, the necessary condition, but it is not in itself the sacrifice. This consists in the outpouring of the life-blood on or about the altar or other place set apart for the purpose. In this action was symbolized the offering and surrender of the victim's life to God, since in accordance with ancient ideas the life was contained in the blood. It is a fact worth noticing in connection with this that in the sacrificial ritual of most religions, while the actual slaying could be performed by any one—either he who brought the sacrifice or some lay official appointed for the purpose—the outpouring of the blood and also the burning of the flesh on the altar, when this was done, were acts reserved to the priest alone. The offerer of the sacrifice had done his part in presenting the victim and in slaying it, thus surrendering his own right over its life. It was for the priest, the intermediary between God and man, to bring the victim near to God, to effect what the offerer desired, by presenting the "life in the blood" at the very altar itself which represented God or was even believed to denote His actual presence. In the case of offerings of bread, meal or wine, the whole act of sacrifice was contained in the burning and outpouring on or about the altar. But, as in the case of living victims, the object was not to destroy the offerings, but to convey them to God. This rite of burning symbolized partly the entire surrender of the offerings, partly their acceptance by God, for the sacrificial fire was really a symbol of His presence, while the

outpouring of the libations was analogous to that of the victim's blood.⁷

The fault of the destruction theory seems to lie in this, that by making destruction as such the essential object of sacrifice, the element of offering is practically eliminated and a sacrifice becomes merely a dramatic ceremony symbolizing the Divine power over life and death. It is taken for granted that sacrifice is an oblation, and it is so spoken of over and over again in treatises on the subject—as an oblation offered by means of destruction. But it is never clearly explained in what sense destruction can be called a means of offering, and it is difficult to see how an object that is destroyed can be said to be offered. The only explanation the present writer has as yet come across that seems to reconcile these two contradictory ideas in a satisfactory manner is that given in an interesting article by the Rev. P. Sexton which appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for August, 1898, under the same title as the present essay.⁸ According to this writer sacrifice is the most perfect outward expression of two important truths of religion: (1) That all things in creation belong to God and depend upon Him for their very existence. (2) That nevertheless God has no need of any of them, being all-sufficient in Himself.

In the sacrificial rite two elements must be distinguished, one positive, the other negative, symbolizing respectively the positive and negative ideas expressed above. In the act of presentation, of bringing the victim before God and offering it to Him, God is recognized as the author of all things and as having supreme dominion over all. In the destruction which follows, His entire independence of all the works of His hands is strikingly shown forth.

Clear and reasonable as this explanation sounds, it may be questioned whether it really answers to the conception of sacrifice found in either revealed or ethnic religion. If it did, we ought to find the whole ritual of sacrifice concentrated round the act of immolation, the slaying of the victim, the burning of its flesh, and so on. On the contrary, however, we find that the central point of a sacrifice was the offering and application of the victim's blood, in which its life was offered to the Deity, the bonds of union between Him and His people renewed and the purifying virtue attaching to the sacrificial blood applied to the offerers. The burning of its flesh caused the victim to ascend in the cloud of smoke from the altar "as a sweet savour" before the throne of God. This seems clear in the sacrifices of the Old Testament, in which we find no word of destruction symbolizing the wrath of God or His power over life and death.

⁷ "The Temple: Its Ministry and Services" (Dr. Edersheim), Chap. V., pp. 90 and 91.

⁸ "The Nature of Sacrifice," by P. Sexton, S. T. L.

In the religions of the pagan world the same ritual and the same symbolism is found as in the revealed religion of Israel, but far less coherent and mingled with much superstition.

The objection to the oblation theory, in the eyes of the writer quoted above, an objection which he considers justifies his own views, is that in the contention that the whole object of sacrifice was to offer up, hand over and consecrate the victim or oblation entirely to God, the element of destruction is not sufficiently accounted for. If this "handing over" of the victim to God formed the whole ratio of sacrifice, we ought to find in the sacrifices offered, as they often were in ancient times, to deified Kings and heroes still living, that the element of destruction was absent, since the offering could be placed entirely in their power by the mere fact of presenting it to them. Yet such sacrifices formed no exception to the general rule. Victims were slain, offerings were burnt and libations poured out in honor of Kings just as they were in honor of the gods. To this objection it may be briefly answered that in most cases it was not so much the King or ruler himself that was worshiped as the Divine spirit by which he was supposed to be "possessed." Sacrifice was offered not to the man, as ordinary gifts might have been offered, but to the god who dwelt or manifested himself in the man.⁹

If in some cases, as apparently in the Egyptian religion, Kings were actually worshiped in themselves as living gods, it must be remembered that such a form of worship is a comparatively late development in the history of religion—a stage in its downward progress. When men came to be looked upon or treated as gods from motives of fear or merely out of compliment, the recognized service paid to the Divine powers from time immemorial was transferred bodily to them without much thought of adaptation to different circumstances or realization of its inner meaning.¹⁰ It is well known to students of comparative religion that ritual in the old religions was for the most part mere external formalism, kept up by religious conservatism even when its real significance had been entirely lost. The ritual had been handed down by tradition from age to age as the proper service of the gods, revealed to men by the gods themselves, and thus far too sacred to be changed or tampered with in any way. To carry out the prescribed ceremonial according to the prescribed method in accordance with the will of the gods was enough; it was unnecessary and even dangerous to inquire too closely into its meaning. On the whole, the oblation theory seems to be the one that best "colligates the facts," as Mr. Andrew Lang would put it. Its chief fault is that, being practically a reaction

⁹ "The Mysteries of Mithra," Professor Cumont.

¹⁰ "Hastings' Dict. of the Bible," extra volume, "Religion of Egypt," p. 187, as far as Egyptian "king-gods" are concerned.

against the older view, it is perhaps inclined to fall into the fault of all reactions and to rush to the opposite extreme. In combatting the excessive importance attached by its rival theory to the element of destruction, the oblation theory is disposed to minimize too far its real importance in the sacrificial idea. The whole essence of the latter being considered to lie in the consecration and handing over to God of that which is offered, it is maintained that any act whereby this result could be effectually secured or fittingly symbolized would be sufficient. While destruction, therefore, is no doubt the usual mode of offering sacrifice, it cannot be said to be the only or essential mode. The great Jesuit theologian Suarez, in his treatise on sacrifice "in communi," says that any action whereby an oblation was consecrated and in some sense changed from its former state (*actio consecrativa et immutativa*) would be sufficient to fulfill the ratio of sacrifice without any immolation or destruction being necessary.¹¹ He suggests, as an example of this, the offering of the shew bread or loaves of proposition in the Jewish ritual of both tabernacle and temple. This rite has, however, always been the subject of controversy, and the question whether or not it can be called a sacrifice in the strict sense is disputed. The shew bread consisted of twelve unleavened loaves, or rather cakes, which were laid upon a golden table in the sanctuary on the north side of the altar of incense. On these loaves was placed pure frankincense (Vulg. *thus lucidissimum*). According to the directions given in Levit. xxiv., 5-9, the rite of offering simply consisted in laying out the loaves on the table on the Sabbath day, where they remained till the next Sabbath. They were then eaten by the priests within the precincts of the temple, the incense having first been burnt on the altar of holocausts.

From the terms applied to it in the Bible the shew bread certainly seems to have been looked upon as forming part of the regular sacrificial system. The word used in connection with it in Hebrew means a burnt-offering. On the other hand, it is clear that no part of the oblation itself was burnt; it remained whole and entire on the golden table until it was eaten by the priests in the sacred banquet. Some consider that the burning of the superimposed incense, together with the consumption of the loaves by the priest, constituted the necessary act of destruction required in a sacrifice.¹² Others deny that this is sufficient, for the incense formed no integral part of the oblation, and the act of eating the shew bread cannot be regarded as the destruction of the offering, but rather as an act of communion with Him to whom it was offered.

Others, again, who uphold the oblation theory defend the strict

¹¹ Suarez, De Sacramentis, Pars 1a, Disp. lxxiii., par. v. Qualis esse debeat res vel actio quae in sacrificio ad significandum imponitur.

¹² Franzelin, Tractatus de SS. Euch. Sacram. and Sacrif., c. 1., Thesis ij.

sacrificial character of the shew bread, while they point to the absence of any destruction as proof of their own contentions. The sacrificial action, they contend, consisted merely in the presentation of the loaves in the holy place—actually “before the Lord.” In this way they received a special consecration, changing them from common to sacred bread, and were more completely handed over to God than any of the other sacrifices consumed on the altar without.

Against this, however, it may be remarked that in the text the shew bread, while spoken of as a sacrifice, is so called only in virtue of the incense offered with it and afterwards burnt on the altar in the outer court. In verse 7 it is said that this incense was placed on the loaves that it might be “to the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord.”

The word translated “memorial” in the English version (Vulg. *monimentum*) is applied to that portion of the offerings that was actually burnt on the altar. The part thus burnt was a substitute for the whole, since the whole really belonged to God, and it was a “memorial” of the sacrifice in the sense of representing it or witnessing to the fact that it was being offered to Him.

In the case of the shew bread, of which for special reasons no part could be burnt, the incense took the place of the memorial portion. The objection that it was not an integral part of the oblation, as in the case of the other similar offerings described in Leviticus, can hardly hold good when the essentially substitutionary character of sacrifice is remembered. Moreover, the plain words of Scripture on this point can hardly be gainsaid by any a priori considerations. The argument that the special consecration received by being offered in the sanctuary itself constituted for the shew bread the necessary “actio sacrificandi” will not in reality suffice. It is true that the shew bread is spoken of as “most holy . . . of the offerings of the Lord made by fire” (R. V. Levit. xxiv., 9), but these identical words are used with reference to the other offerings of bread or meal, the so-called “meat offerings” prescribed in the earlier chapters of the book, and also with reference to the sacrifices for sin.¹³

Again, the shew bread was not the only sacrifice that was brought into the sanctuary. In certain sin-offerings, after the victim had been slain in the outer court, the priest carried its blood into the holy place, sprinkled it seven times before the veil of the Holy of Holies, and finally anointed with it the horns of the altar of incense.¹⁴ Again, on the Day of Atonement the High Priest carried the blood of the goat offered “for Yahweh” into the very Holy of Holies

¹³ Vide Levit. ii., 3, 10; vi., 17; x., 12; also vi., 25, 29; vii., 46. With regard to the class of sacrifices called “most holy,” cf. Edersheim, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

¹⁴ Levit. iv., 4-8.

itself.¹⁵ This seems to indicate that the shew bread merely belonged to that class of sacrifices reckoned as "most holy," and not that it possessed any exclusive holiness as a species apart. But its exact significance and the interesting questions that arise in connection with the Holy Eucharist, of which it is so striking a type, would require an article to itself.

Another example sometimes quoted in favor of sacrifice without destruction is the sacrifice of Melchisedech described in Genesis xiv., 18-19. From the text it would appear that the ritual merely consisted in "bringing forth," that is, offering or presenting, the oblations of bread and wine to God. But this is hardly a safe text on which to found an argument. For, in the first place, granting that the action of Melchisedech in this case was in reality a sacrifice, the fact that no account of any sacrificial action other than that of presentation is found, is no proof that such did not exist. The writer of this passage was writing for his own times, and would not think it necessary to go into minute descriptions of a rite so well known and understood by every one in his day. In the second place, however, it is not at all certain that this "bringing forth" of bread and wine by Melchisedech was sacrificial. Catholic tradition has, it is true, always held that it was, and has always regarded it as an evident type of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Just as Melchisedech, the priest-king of the ancient sacred city of Jerusalem, brought forth offerings of bread and wine as priest of the Most High God, so Jesus Christ, Priest after the order of Melchisedech, brought forth on the night of His Passion the Bread of Life and the Chalice of Salvation—He who was Priest and King not only of Jerusalem and the Jews, but of the whole earth. So, too, in imitation of her Divine Master, and in obedience to His expressed commands, the Church daily brings forth these sacred offerings wherein honor is paid to the Most High God and man is strengthened with the Food of Eternal Life. Modern criticism, however, sees in the offerings of the priest-king of Salem nothing more than an act of hospitality shown to Abraham and his soldiers after their victory over the rivals of the King of Sodom. The particle *enim* (for) which in the Vulgate connects the offerings of bread and wine with the priestly character of Melchisedech, is in the Hebrew version represented by the conjunction *vau*, which merely means *and*, and hence deprives the sentence of its significance.

The question is too long a one to enter upon in this place, but it may be remarked in passing that *vau* copulative often introduces a causal or explanatory clause and is then to be rendered by *for* or *now*. For example, Exod. xxiii., 9.

¹⁵ Levit. xvi., 15.

The chief fault of the oblation theory, as we have seen, is that it is inclined to minimize the importance attaching to the sacrificial immolation or destruction, and to place the whole essence of sacrifice in the handing over and consecration to God of the oblation. But, as Bishop Hedley remarks, "the broad features of universal tradition and of Old Testament revelation force us to recognize that the impressive word Sacrifice covers a human impulse, whether a natural impulse merely or one inspired or fostered by the Holy Spirit, that has urged men to kill, to burn and to destroy in the worship of the Deity. That impulse, put into execution upon millions of altars in every region of the world throughout all ages and consecrated by the ordinance and the gracious acceptance of God, especially in the worship of the temple, is what men mean when they talk of sacrifice."¹⁶

The truth is that defenders of the oblation theory when arguing against their opponents are inclined to wander from the actual state of the case to the ideal notion of sacrifice. They argue, and justly, against the destruction theory that expiation for sin is not the primary end for which sacrifice is offered. But they further argue from this that the death or destruction of the sacrifice is necessary only as consequent upon this special aspect of the rite and is no part of its essential idea. This, in a sense, is perfectly true; homage paid to God as the author of all things, and especially of life, thanksgiving for favors received and intercession for others desired are the ends for which sacrifice could and no doubt would have been offered had sin never entered into the world. Death and destruction, the wages of sin, would also without doubt have been absent, and the mere act of presentation to God, of solemn consecration to His service would have sufficed to constitute a sacrifice. But the question on hand is not what sacrifice would have been or might have been, but what it actually is and always has been, and it is a fact that whatever the nature of a sacrifice or of the ends for which it was offered, the death of the victim or the destruction of the offering has always entered into the ritual as an essential part of it.

While expiation for sin is not the primary or root-idea of sacrifice, it is certainly in the present dispensation the most prominent one. This is only natural after all, for sinful man cannot approach God or offer Him a pleasing worship unless he first acknowledge his sins and endeavor to atone for them. In the ritual of the Old Testament when several sacrifices were to be offered the sin-offering always preceded the holocaust, or the peace-offering. So, too, in every sacrifice the victim must be slain and its life-blood shed. Even the offerings of food and drink must be burnt or poured out in order to

¹⁶ "The Holy Eucharist," Chap. IX.; "The Eucharistic Sacrifice," p. 160.

be offered. In every sacrifice man must be reminded of his fall—his “sin must be ever before him.” It is not for a moment maintained that these ideas were explicitly and consciously held even in the revealed religion of Israel, and still less among the darkness and errors of paganism. But they were latent there, only waiting to be brought to the surface in the supreme fulfillment of all sacrificial types, the Sacrifice of the Cross. Considerations such as these will be appreciated only by those who believe in the divinity of our Lord and in the atoning sacrifice offered by Him on the Cross and continued till the end of time on the altars of His Church. Only those who accept the full Christian position can grasp the real significance of sacrifice.

But although the death of the victim is to be looked on as the punishment for the sins of the offerer, undergone by the victim in his stead, this does not form the complete idea of sacrifice even in the case of those sacrifices offered especially for sin. The sacrifice, as we have seen above, did not come to an end with the death of the victim; this was only a means towards an end, that end being the shedding and sprinkling of the blood. By means of this the life of a pure unspotted creature was given up to God as a pleasing substitute for the evil life of the offerer, and its atoning virtue consequent on his gracious acceptance of it was applied to wash away the stain of sin. Its object was not only to satisfy the divine anger by the death of the victim, but to give pleasure to God and reconcile Him once more to man by offering Him a gift pleasing in itself. The idea of merit must be joined with that of satisfaction in order to make up the complete notion of expiatory sacrifice.

Here again the essentially typical character of sacrifice is plainly shown, for no animal, no mere human being even, however pure and spotless, could in itself be pleasing to God or suffice to wash away the sins of man in its blood. The sin-offerings of Israel and those offered throughout the world all pointed to the One who was alone to bear the transgressions of His people, and in His Precious Blood to cleanse them from their sins.

The idea that lies at the very root of sacrifice and appears not only in the offerings for sin, but in all its different species and in every religion is that of vicarious substitution. Whatever it is that is offered and for whatever end, it is offered instead of something else; either one thing is offered in the place of another, or the part instead of the whole.

The motive that prompts this act, so sacred in the eyes of all peoples and ever regarded as the most important of all religious rites, is the conception of the supreme dominion or over-lordship of God over man and all he possesses. This conception can be found alike

in all religions, revealed or ethnic, savage or civilized, however the divine nature may be otherwise conceived. Man has never worshiped in the true religious sense of the word any being as divine whom he has not also regarded as far superior to himself in dignity and power and also as demanding such worship from him as a right.¹⁷ Since God has supreme dominion over everything, man himself included, nothing in the world belongs immediately to man. On the other hand, he knows instinctively that the world and all it produces exists for him and was made for him, hence he has a right to take the things he sees around him for his own use. But before he does so he must be careful to acknowledge the prior right of God, to show that he recognizes that all he possesses is his only by virtue of the divine will, and that he holds these things in his possession as a tenant from his over-lord. Universal tradition has taught man to do this by offering or rather abandoning a part of all he possesses or is about to make his own to the divine powers, in the belief that the latter will accept the part for the whole, and, pleased by the act of homage and submission, will allow the free use of what remains for human purposes.

Sacrifice is then a vicarious oblation, but not every vicarious oblation is a sacrifice. There are two points wherein a sacrifice is distinguished from all other oblations as a species apart—namely, the nature of that which is offered in the sacrifice and the way in which it is offered. In other words, the “matter” and “form.” The form has already been dealt with, and consisted, as we have seen, in the slaying and shedding of the victim’s blood when a living victim was offered, or in the destruction by means of burning or outpouring of the offerings of food and drink. As to the “matter,” the merest acquaintance with sacrificial ritual in the different religions of the world makes it clear that in a sacrifice strictly so-called it was always a living creature and (with very rare exceptions) one that belonged to the class that serves in the support of human life, that is, domesticated animals. Offerings of food and drink, cakes, wine, incense, too, and other sweet perfumes, the usual accompaniments of festive banquets in ancient times, and especially in the East, were also presented to the gods in sacrifice. It is noticeable, however, that these “unbloody” oblations were usually offered together with the living victim, forming one sacrifice with it. They were sometimes offered independently, but generally as substitutes only for the animal sacrifices. The “matter” of the sacrifice is thus, properly speaking, a life, or at least that which is so intimately connected with life that it may serve as a fitting symbol of it. Among primi-

¹⁷ “*Études sur les religions Sémitiques*” (Lagrange), Chap. VII, “*Le Sacrifice*,” also, “*The Making of Religion*” (A. Lang).

tive races, whether nomadic or cultivators of the soil, nothing is so precious as are the flocks and herds that serve them for food and clothing and are the chief source of their livelihood. Over these the Divine Powers have dominion as over everything else, but in a more special way, since they have life, and the life of both man and beast is especially sacred to God. Just as the first fruits of the harvest, and indeed of everything else that belongs to man, so the firstlings of the flocks must be set aside and dedicated to His service. This, in the case of living creatures, could only be carried out effectually by slaying the victim chosen to represent its fellows, and thus putting it out of the power of its immediate owner and rendering it useless to him. Apart from all idea of sin and the punishment due to it, under the existing condition of things the death of the victim was the only means whereby its life could be really and effectually surrendered to God. Temples, lands, offerings of gold and silver could all be dedicated to God's service, and such a dedication and consecration was certainly a religious act acceptable to God, but it was not a sacrifice. Such oblations could be offered to God by any one, whether layman or priest, but a sacrifice, the offering of a life, could in normal circumstances be made to God through the medium of a priest alone.¹⁸ Sacrifice, as its very name implies, is *the* sacred act par excellence. The reason of this is not difficult to see. Life has always been looked upon as something mysterious and "awful," as something belonging in a special way to the Deity.

While sacrifice, as a regular institution of public worship, demands a certain degree of civilization and presupposes an organized system of external cultus, it is most probable that in early ages all slaughter was sacrificial and every meal wherein the flesh of animals was eaten was at the same time a sacrifice.¹⁹ Meals such as these were and still are comparatively rare occurrences among simple races, especially in the East, and were always occasions of great solemnity and general rejoicing. If an animal is required for food it must be slain; but if it is slain, this must be done in honor of the god and its life offered to him in the blood. To interfere with that which belongs in so special a manner to the Supreme Power, is an act fraught with danger to man if it be not protected by the safeguards of religion. But the divine rights having been recognized by the act of oblation and the outpouring of the victim's blood, the feast might proceed without fear of danger. From this preliminary consecration the banquet that followed was itself considered a sacred

¹⁸ Instances may occur, and, in fact, do occur in the O. T. of sacrifices offered by laymen, but these are extraordinary cases—the exceptions which prove the rule. It is from the normal course of things that the nature of a rite like sacrifice must be judged.

¹⁹ "Hastings' Dict. of the Bible," Vol. I, Art. "Blood," p. 307.

action. Those who partook of it sat as it were at the table of their God, since they were feasting on the provisions of His bounty.

Such is the origin of the sacrificial banquet, so prominent a feature of a certain class of sacrifices, and in fact an integral part of the very idea, since it betokens the end for which all sacrifice is offered, communion and friendship with God—the end of religion itself. Understood in this sense, the “banquet theory” of sacrifice is perfectly legitimate. Among modern Arab tribes the slaughter of animals for food is still invested with a religious character, and the blood is always carefully poured out in the name of Allah.²⁰ The Israelites, too, while in the desert were commanded in their ritual law to slay all animals, even those required for ordinary food, at the door of the tabernacle, and to pour out the blood in that sacred spot.²¹

In its origin, or at least in its earliest form as far as this can be discovered, sacrifice was negative rather than positive in character. It was a surrender rather than an offering in the actual sense. But as civilization progressed and the sense of possession became more marked, man felt himself more in the position of offering gifts to his God. Not that these gifts were believed to supply a want—even the lowest of modern savages have instinctively a higher conception of the Divine Nature than that²²—but because it was believed that God would accept them as tokens of homage and gratitude or in expiation of offenses committed against Him; or, again, they were offered as an inducement to gaining the favors of His bounty. In much the same way subjects in Eastern countries approach their sovereign with gifts of all kinds; children, among ourselves as well, give presents to their father and mother, on whom they know they are dependent for everything.

With the growth and organization of external worship a regular system of sacrifices at stated times and for various purposes came into being, and the different species of sacrifice, sin-offerings, peace-offerings and holocausts were developed. But in all of these the fundamental ideas are found unchanged. The shedding and application of the victim's blood is in each the central pivot on which all else turns. According to ancient ideas, as we have seen, the life both of man and of beast was supposed to reside in the blood, the principle of life. Hence the mysterious character and efficacy attributed to blood in all ancient religions, and hence, too, the various rules and “tabus” regarding its use, especially as food.²³ In Holy Scripture, as we know, it was strictly forbidden to eat the blood with

²⁰ “Encycl. Biblica,” Art. “Sacrifice,” Vol. IV., col. 4,185.

²¹ Levit. xvii., 3 and 4.

²² “The Making of Religion,” A. Lang.

²³ Art. “Blood” in “Hastings’ Dict. of Bible,” Vol. I.

the flesh, because, in the words of the Law, "the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life."²⁴

Besides symbolizing the oblation of the victim's life to God, and in the sin-offerings the cleansing away of the stain of sin, the shedding and sprinkling of the sacrificial blood betokened a species of covenant between God and man. The blood of the sacrifice represented both that of God and that of His worshipers and served as a medium of communication between them.²⁵

The origin of sacrifice, whether, that is, it is due immediately to direct revelation from God or whether it is to be ascribed in the first instance to the promptings of natural religion alone, must, as far as history is concerned, ever remain a mystery. But whether it is directly due to the primal revelation or must be put down to the natural instinct of religious man, sacrifice must always remain an essential element of true religion. In sacrifice the attitude of man towards his Creator is clearly and impressively set forth, and even in the degraded forms found in the religions of the pagan world its true significance is not altogether lost. The sense of dependence on a higher Power, the feeling that sin is evil and displeasing to Him who rules the universe, the desire to show gratitude, to ask for help and favor, these are all true religious sentiments, however dark and obscure they may have become, and all find expression in the rite of sacrifice. Even human sacrifice is a striking witness to the truth that besides that of animals, the highest form of life as well belongs to God, and further that it is owing to Him in expiation for man's sin. The first born offered for its parents—"the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul"²⁶—the human scapegoat for the city or State, all testify to this ineradicable persuasion of fallen man, and point, as does every sacrifice, to that Divine Victim in whose Precious Blood all honor and glory is offered to God and every sin is washed away.

In Jesus Christ sacrifice finds its true fulfillment. In His self-oblation on the Cross to His Heavenly Father, all that the old sacrifices strove to express is realized in the fullest sense. This supreme oblation has taken the place of all those ancient rites that were but "shadows of better things to come."

But sacrifice has not come to an end with the Sacrifice of the Cross. Offered once in blood, the Saviour of the world continues still to offer Himself on the altars of His Church in the "Mystery

²⁴ Levit. xvii., 11.

²⁵ "études," Lagrange, Chap. VII., p. 260.

²⁶ Micah vi., 7.

of Faith." The old prophecy is now fulfilled, for "in every place there is sacrifice, and in every place is offered to God's name a clean oblation."²⁷

BENEDICT STEUART, O. S. B.

Fort Augustus, Scotland.

H. C. LEA ON ST. JEROME AND SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION.

AMONG the fathers cited by Lea in his "History of Confession and Indulgences" to prove that the power of the keys was not recognized in the early Church, or at least that private, auricular confession was held in disfavor, St. Jerome, perhaps, stands out most prominently. In the course of the seventh chapter of his work the author refers no less than four or five times to the "damaging testimony" of this great Doctor—a testimony which, he assures us, "proved a veritable stumbling-block to theologians until they concluded to ignore it." In this connection it should be borne in mind, first of all, that the opinion of one or two fathers of any age or country is not sufficient either to establish or to overthrow a doctrine. In either case we are justified in demanding, if not a practical unanimity or consensus of opinion, at least a majority or preponderance, whether in numbers or weight of authority. In the second place—it seems almost superfluous to mention it—we do not claim that the tenets of our creed were as thoroughly understood or as clearly defined in the first centuries as they are at the present day, and private confession is no exception to the rule. In theology, as in the natural sciences, there has been a growth, an evolution. When Christ compared the growth of His Church to the growth of the mustard seed He had in mind not only its numerical, but its doctrinal and moral development likewise. Nearly every one knows this nowadays, and thus far we find no difficulty in agreeing with Lea. But as regards the nature of that growth we disagree with him in toto. This is the parting of the ways. It is not, as he would have it, a growth from without, a growth by accretion or addition, like the growth of a snow man or a pile of stones; on the contrary, it is the growth of a living organism, the natural and healthy development of the living germ, the outcome of a vital principle within, just as we find in the evolution of the plant or of man himself. In short, the teaching of the Church to-day anent sacramental confession is nothing more than a logical deduction from the

²⁷ Malach. i., 11.

sound premises contained in the teaching of Christ Himself and His Apostles. If Lea had taken the trouble to read carefully and with unbiased mind Cardinal Newman's "Development of Doctrine," he could easily have informed himself on this point. And now, applying our principles to the testimony of St. Jerome, we arrive at two conclusions: First. That we must not expect to find in his writings the clear and explicit utterances of modern theologians, the more so as he nowhere professedly treats of the Sacrament of Penance. Secondly. That, even were his testimony as damaging as Lea would have us believe, it would not of itself afford a sufficient reason for rejecting the dogma. With these facts before us, let us endeavor to ascertain the views which St. Jerome really held on this subject and the value of the grounds on which Lea bases his claims.

Glancing over the eighty-third epistle or letter of the saint, we note that he considered the confession of faults an excellent practice in itself, since he terms it "a second plank after shipwreck." We cannot, however, attach any great importance to this passage, for the context does not warrant the belief that he is speaking of sacramental confession, either public or private. He is just after acknowledging some of his own youthful follies by way of atonement or reparation, and the words which he employs would seem in the circumstances to mean nothing more than our English expression: "An open confession is good for the soul." In the tenth chapter of his "Commentary on Ecclesiastes," however, we find something more definite: "If any one infected with the poison of sin remains silent, does not perform penance, *and is unwilling to lay bare his wound to his brother and master*, the brother and master who has a tongue to cure him cannot easily be of any avail to him. For, if the sick man is ashamed to disclose his wound to the physician, medicine cannot remedy an evil whose existence is unknown." Evidently the force of the testimony found in this passage depends on the signification of the words "brother and master." If St. Jerome used them to designate the priest, we have here a clear enough proof of the existence of auricular confession; and not only of its utility, but also of its absolute necessity. And that such was his meaning is highly probable from the passage itself, and *certain* from subsequent utterances which I shall quote. Had he mentioned only the word "brother" we might reasonably conclude that he spoke of Christians in general, but the addition of "master" throws light on the passage and gives it an altogether new aspect. And, as far as the strength of the argument is concerned, it is not a matter of great moment whether the two words relate to the same or to different persons, though the use of "brother *and* master" rather than "brother *or* master" seems to indicate one and the same individual—

“brother” in the faith, “master” in the spiritual life. The important point to be considered is that there is no choice in the matter. To obtain a cure it is absolutely necessary to confess to the “master.” And who is this “master?” He “who has a tongue to cure”—not merely to alleviate present suffering or prevent future ills by his advice, but to effect, moreover, a genuine, radical cure. In a word, the priest, the spiritual physician, whose medicine—the absolution given in God’s name—is powerful enough to wipe out the very source of the evil. That such was St. Jerome’s meaning appears sufficiently clear. In fact, Lea himself admits in a half-hearted way, in Volume I, page 179 of his work, that this passage refers to private or sacramental confession. But should anything more be needed, the following excerpts will, I think, fully bear out our interpretation. In his forty-first epistle (*ad Marcellam*), written for the purpose of refuting the Montanists, who wished to limit or restrict the power of forgiving sins, the saint says: “With us Bishops hold the place of the Apostles. They (the Montanists) close the doors of the Church for almost every sin, while we read daily in the Scripture: ‘I will not the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live.’ They are rigid, not that they may not be guilty of worse sins. But the difference between us is this: They are ashamed to confess their sins, as though they were just, while we do penance (by confessing), and thus more easily obtain pardon.” Again, in his fourteenth epistle (*ad Heliodorum Monachum*) he says: “Far be it from me to speak ill of those who have succeeded the Apostles and who, having the keys of the kingdom of heaven, judge in a manner before the Day of Judgment.”

Commenting on these words, Lea remarks: “It is true that in one passage he speaks of Bishops as succeeding to the Apostles and as holders of the keys of heaven, judging after a fashion before the Day of Judgment; but he qualifies this by adding that all Bishops are not Bishops. ‘There was Peter, but there was also Judas. It is not easy to hold the place of Peter and Paul, and the salt that has lost its savor is useless, save to be cast out.’ Ordination evidently conferred no power on those unworthy of it.” Here at least we have an admission, all the more valuable because it is so grudgingly given, that Bishops are successors of the Apostles, have the power of the keys and judge before the Day of Judgment. As far as the existence of the pardoning power in the Church is concerned (and that is all we are contending for—we are not dealing here with the reasons for which that power was delegated to priests) we should scarcely require a clearer or a stronger proof from an orthodox Roman Catholic theologian of the twentieth century. But what about the words that follow, “All Bishops are not Bishops,” etc.?

We freely concede that Lea's translation is correct; there is no mistake in it, and no fault to be found with it; but, unfortunately for the author himself and for the many others whom his erroneous conclusions are apt to lead astray, there is wanting something far more important than mere accuracy of translation, to wit, the shrewdness and critical ability necessary to grasp the real meaning or thought of St. Jerome. Had he read between the lines, had he caught the drift of the passage; nay, had he but paused a moment to consider some of the idioms of his own mother tongue, he would not have been so crude in his interpretation. How often do we ourselves use such expressions as, "There are priests and priests; there are lawyers and lawyers," etc., to signify that some priests and some lawyers are richly endowed with the priestly or legal requirements, while others are deficient in them, though, as a matter of fact, we do not for an instant intend to deny that both classes possess the requisite sacerdotal or legal character and powers. The sense of St. Jerome in the above quoted passage is manifestly the same. Not all who are Bishops possess the virtues of their high calling; some are unfaithful to their sacred trust. And to make himself better understood, he immediately adds: "There is Peter, but there is Judas likewise. You see Stephen, but look also at Nicholas." Does he mean to imply that Judas was not an Apostle or Nicholas a deacon? Certainly not. His meaning is that both fell far below the requirements of their state, and that their exalted position or holy vocation was of itself by no means sufficient to save them. The whole passage is a treatise on the obligation of clerics to live up to the duties of their state and to remember that "to whom much is given, of him much will be exacted." No one who reads the quotation with unbiased mind can draw any other sensible meaning from it. It in no wise limits the powers of all validly consecrated Bishops; it in no wise diminishes the force of his testimony that Bishops hold the place of the Apostles, have the keys of the kingdom of heaven and judge in a certain manner even before the Day of Judgment. But perhaps one of the clearest indications of St. Jerome's views on the subject, and one of the strongest proofs of the existence of sacramental confession in his day, is found in the very passage which Lea so triumphantly flaunts in our faces. The most "damaging" part of the "damaging testimony" to which he so often refers, the part which, according to him, has proved for ages the "pons asinorum" of Catholic theologians, is found in St. Jerome's commentary on the tenth chapter of St. Matthew ("I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc.), and runs as follows: "Bishops and priests, not understanding the force of this passage, assume to themselves something of Pharisaic supercilious-

ness, *insomuch that they think they can condemn the innocent or release the guilty*, while God considers not so much the sentence of the priest as the life of the accused. We read in Leviticus that lepers were ordered to show themselves to the priests, not that the priests could make them clean or unclean, but because they had a knowledge of leprosy and could distinguish the clean from the unclean. So likewise the Bishop or priest here binds or looses, not those who are innocent or guilty, *but, in accordance with his office, when he has heard the different kinds of sins* he knows who should be bound and who should be loosed." Now where, I ask, in the name of common sense is the insurmountable difficulty in this passage? The closing words are an explicit declaration that the Bishop or priest has the right, "in accordance with his office," to hear the varieties, or "*different kinds of sins*," and pronounce judgment accordingly. No Catholic theologian, no Catholic layman even who is at all acquainted with Catholic tradition and imbued with Catholic sentiments would think for a single instant of interpreting these words as an arraignment of sacramental confession, and that not because of any favorable prejudice or preconceived notions on the subject, but because he cannot fail to see at a glance that the principles laid down by St. Jerome are in perfect harmony with the spirit and teachings of his Church. If Lea has failed to hit the mark, as he certainly has, it is because he is out of his element. Beyond the influence of that strong current of Catholic life and feeling which enables us to understand our co-religionists and to be, in turn, understood by them, he can no more enter into the spirit and meaning of a passage like this than could a Roman historian like Tacitus or Suetonius into the religious life and notions of the Jews of old.

Who among us can fail to see that St. Jerome is inveighing, not against the power of the keys, which he expressly admits ("*cum audierit varietates peccatorum*—when he has heard the different kinds of sins"), but against the *abuse of that power* by certain Bishops and priests who imagined themselves supreme judges, and without taking into consideration the dispositions of the penitent gave or refused absolution according to their own whims and caprices? Such ignorant and high-handed ministers he very justly likens to the Pharisees, and informs them that their arbitrary mode of acting is not sanctioned by Almighty God; that their unjust sentence will not be ratified in heaven, since they act not as the representatives of a just God and in accordance with His laws, but rather under the promptings of their own base passions. Hence their decision, irrespective as it is of the penitent's good or evil dispositions, can neither justify nor condemn. Which of us would not say the very same to-day? There is not a Catholic theologian living

who does not agree with St. Jerome. Consider, too, the analogy between the priest and the leper in the Old Dispensation and the priest and the penitent in the New. It is the self-same idea which St. Jerome wishes to convey to us. As under the Old Law the priest was tied to the facts in the case and could neither make a man clean nor unclean by his mere word, so also in the new order of things the priest, independently of the penitent's dispositions, cannot by his mere sentence render him either just or unjust. His part or office is simply to pass judgment on the facts presented to him. He is to hear "the varietates peccatorum or different kinds of sins," to judge of the penitent's dispositions and pass sentence accordingly.

Perhaps after reading Lea's confident and apparently well-grounded assertions, and even after a first hurried glance over the passages which he cites, one will count on finding in St. Jerome very little in favor of the practice of private or auricular confession. Of course, if he believes in the orthodoxy of the fathers he will scarcely expect to find St. Jerome inimical to the belief and practice of the early Church, but as far as positive proof is concerned he is likely to aim rather low. The very admissions of Lea—seemingly so candid and truth-loving—will only serve to strengthen this impression. But on closer examination, after accumulating and comparing the various utterances of the saint, after studying them in the light of the context, the occasion, the end he had in view and the general drift of the writings in which they are found, he must come to the conclusion that the learned "historian" is not the painstaking investigator that he professes to be; that he is not a skillful interpreter or even an impartial reviewer or narrator of facts, but, on the contrary, a special pleader, holding a brief against the doctrine and practice of auricular confession. In short, he must be convinced that Lea had a thesis to defend, and in order to do it found himself obliged to adapt the facts to his theory. The admissions, of which he makes so light, are the very marrow of St. Jerome's teaching anent private confession, while the "stumbling-block," the "damaging testimony" or "the pons asinorum" rests on a misinterpretation utterly unworthy of a man who makes any pretensions to critical acumen. If this is a case in which Virgil's "ab uno disce omnes" holds good—and we greatly fear it is—most assuredly we cannot place much reliance on Mr. Lea as a historian.

JOHN E. GRAHAM.

Baltimore, Md.

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBUS ARCHIEPISCOPIS EPISCOPIS ALIISQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIIS PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTIBUS.

PIUS PP. X.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem:

COMMUNIONUM rerum inter asperas vices additasque nuper domesticas calamitates quibus animus Noster dolore premitur, plane recreat ac reficit christiani populi universi recens conspiratio pietatis, quae adhuc esse non desinit "spectaculum mundo et angelis et hominibus" (I. Cor. iv., 9), a praesenti facie malorum forte excitata promotius, sed ab una denique causa profecta, Iesu Christi Domini Nostri caritate. Quum enim huius nominis digna virtus nulla in terris exstiterit nec possit esse nisi per Christum, Ipsi uni accepti referendi sunt fructus qui ab ea dimanant inter homines etiam in fide remissiores aut religioni infensos, in quibus si quod exstat vestigium verae caritatis, id omne humanitati a Christo illatae debetur, quam ipsi totam exuere et a christiana societate propulsare nondum valuerunt.

Hac tanta contentione quaerentium Patri solatia et fratribus opem in communibus et privatis aerumnis, commotis Nobis vix verba suppetunt, quibus grati animi sensus exprimamus. Quos etsi non semel singulis testati sumus, haud remorari voluimus gratiae publice referendae officium exsequi, apud vos primum, Venerabiles Fratres, et per vos apud fideles omnes quicumque sunt vigilantiae vestrae concrediti.

Sed libet etiam gratum animum profiteri palam filiis carissimis, qui, ex omnibus terrarum orbis partibus, tot ac tam praeclaris amoris et observantiae significationibus quinquagenariam sacerdotii Nostri memoriam sunt prosequuti. Quae quidem humanitatis officia, non tam Nostra, quam Religionis et Ecclesiae causa delectarunt, quod impavidae fidei testimonium exstiterint et quasi publica honoris significatio Christo Ecclesiaeque debiti, per obsequium ei exhibitum, quem Dominus familiae suae praepositum voluit. Sed et aliidem genus fructus haud mediocris causam laetitiae attulerunt. Nam et saecularia solemnina institutarum in America Septemtrionali dioecesium occasionem obtulerunt immortales Deo gratias agendi ob additos catholicae Ecclesiae tot filios; et Britannica insula nobilissima spectaculo fuit ob instauratum suos intra fines pompa mirifica honorem

Eucharistiae sanctissimae, adstante Venerabilium Fratrum Nostorum corona cum ipso Legato Nostro ac populo confertissimo; et in Galliis afflicta Ecclesia lacrimas detergit mirata splendor Augusti Sacramenti triumphos Lourdensi maxime in urbe, cuius celebritatis origines gavisus sumus quinquagenario apparatu solemniter fuisse commemoratas. Ex his aliisque norint omnes persuasumque habeant catholici nominis hostes, splendidiore quodam ceremonias exhibitum Augustae Dei Matri cultum, honores ipsos Pontifici Summo tribui solitos, eo tandem spectare ut in omnibus magnificetur Deus; ut sit "omnia et in omnibus Christus" (Coloss. iii., 11); ut, regno Dei in terris constituto, sempiterna comparetur homini salus.

Expectandus divinus hic de singulis ac de universa hominum societate triumphus non alius est nisi aberrantium a Deo ac Ipsum reversio per Christum, ad hunc autem per Ecclesiam suam; quod quidem Nobis esse propositum, vel primis Nostris Apostolicis Litteris "E supremi Apostolatus Cathedra" (Encyclica, diei 4 Octobris, MDCCCIII), et saepe alias, aperte declaravimus. Hunc reditum cum fiducia suspicimus; ad hunc maturandum consilia Nostra sunt et vota conversa, tamquam ad portum, in quo praesentis etiam vitae procellae conquiescant. Atque hoc nimirum quod publice redditi Ecclesiae honores velut indicio, Deo bene iuvante, sint redeuntium gentium ad Christum et Petro Ecclesiaeque arctius adhaerentium, officia humilitati Nostrae persoluta libenti gratoque animo excepi-mus.

Haec autem cum Apostolica Sede caritatis necessitudo etsi non eodem semper aut ubique se gradu prodidit nec uno significationis genere, nihilominus divinae Providentiae consilio factum videtur, ut ea devinctior exstiterit, quo iniquiora, uti modo sunt, tempora sive sanae doctrinae sive sacrae disciplinae, sive Ecclesiae libertati decurrerunt. Coniunctionis id genus exempla sancta viri prae-buerunt iis tempestatibus, quum aut exagitaretur Christi grex, aut aetas vitiis diffunderet; quibus malis opportune Deus obiecit illorum virtutem atque sapientiam. Ex iis unum commemorare hisce Litteris maxime iuvat, cuius in honorem hos ipso anno apparantur saecularia sollemnia, expleto a beatissimo eius exitu octavo saeculo. Is est Augustanus doctor Anselmus, catholicae veritatis adsertor et sacrorum iurium propugnator acerrimus, tum qua monachus et Abbas in Gallia, tum qua Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus et Primas in Anglia. Nec alienum esse arbitramur, post acta splendido ritu sollemnia doctorum Gregorii Magni et Ioannis Chrysostomi quem alterum occidentalis, alterum orientalis Ecclesiae iubar admirati suspicimus aliud intueri sidus, quod, si a prioribus "differt in claritate" (I. Cor. xv., 41), illorum tamen progressionem aemulando,

haud infirmiore lucem exemplorum doctrinaeque diffundit. Quin etiam eo potentior quodammodo dixeris, quo nobis propior Anselmus aetate, loco, indole, studiis, et quo magis accedunt ad horum similitudinem temporum sive luctate genus, sive pastoralis, actionis forma ab ipso in usum deducta, sive instituendi ratio, per se, per discipulos tradita et scriptis maxime confirmata, ex quibus habita est norma "ad defensionum christianae religionis, animarum profectum, et omnium theologorum, qui sacras litteras scholastica methodo tradiderunt." (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis.) Quare sicut in noctis caligine aliis occidentibus stellis, aliae ut mundum illustrent oriuntur, sic ad Ecclesiam illustrandam Patribus filii succedunt, inter quos beatus Anselmus velut clarissimum sidus effulsit.

Ac vere quidem in media aevi sui caligine, vitorum errorumque laqueis impliciti, optimo cuique inter aequales visus est suae fulgore doctrinae ac sanctitatis praelucere. Fuit enim "fidei princeps et decus Ecclesia . . . gloria pontificalis," qui sui temporis "omnes vicerat electos egregiosque viros." (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi.) Idem "et sapiens et bonus et sermone refulgens, ingenio clarus" (In Epitaphio), cuius fama eo usque progressa est, ut merito scriptum sit, non fuisse in terris quemquam, "qui dicere vellet: me minor Anselmus est similisve mihi" (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi); acceptus ob haec, regibus, principibus, Pontificibus Maximis. Nec suis modo sodalibus ac fidei populo, sed "carus habebatur hostibus ipse suis." (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi.) Ad eum eiam tum Abbatem litteras existimationis et benevolentiae plenas misit magnus ille ac fortissimus Pontifex Gregorius VII., quibus "se et Ecclesiam catholicam eius orationibus commendabat." (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis.) Eidem Urbanus II. "religionis ac scientiae praerogativam adseruit." (In libro II. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 32.) Pluribus, iisque amantissimis litteris, Paschalis II. "reverentiam devotionis, fidei robus et piae sollicitudinis instantiam" extulit laudibus, eius auctoritate "religionis ac sapientiae" (In lib. III. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 74 et 42) facile adductus ut fraternitatis suae postulationibus annueret, quem praedicare non dubitavit omnium Angliae episcoporum sapientissimum ac religiosissimum.

Nec tamen aliud esse sibi videbatur nisi contemptibilis homuncio, ignotus homunculus, homo parvae nimis scientiae, vita peccator. Cumque de se tam demisse sentiret, non hoc tamen impediabatur quominus alta cogitaret, contra ea quae malis moribus opinionibusque depravati homines iudicare solent, de quibus sacrae litterae: "Animalis . . . homo non percipit ea quae sunt spiritus Dei." (I. Cor. ii., 14.) Illud vero plus habet admirationis, quod eius magnitudo animi et invicta constantia, tot molestiis, impugnationibus, exsiliis tentata, ea cum lenitate fuit et gratia coniuncta, ut vel

ipsorum iram frangeret qui ei succenserent, eorumque sibi benevolentiam conciliaret. Ita, "quos eius causa gravabat," laudabant tamen "quod bonus ipse foret." (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi.)

Fuit igitur in eo admirabilis quaedam earum partium conspiratio et consensus quas plerique falso arbitrantur secum ipsas necessario pugnare nec ullo pacto posse componi; nudo candori consociata granditas, animo excelso modestia, fortitudini suavitas, pietas doctrinae; adeo ut quemadmodum in instituti sui tirocinio ita etiam in omni vita, "mirum in modum tamquam sanctitatis et doctrinae exemplar ab omnibus haberetur." (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis.)

Neque vero duplex haec Anselmi laus intra domesticos parietes aut magisterii se fines continuit, sed, quasi e militari tabernaculo, processit in solem et pulverem. Sancto enim quae diximus tempora, pro iustitia et veritate fuit ei dimicandum acerrime. Cumque naturae vi ad ea studia ferretur maxime quae in rerum contemplatione versantur, in plura et gravia negotia coniectus est, et, sacro assumpto regimine, in medium devenit rerum certamen atque discrimen. Et qui miti ac suavi erat ingenio, studio tuendae doctrinae ac sanctitatis Ecclesiae compulsus est a tranquillae vitae iucunditate recedere, principum virorum amicitiam gratiamque deserere, dulcissima vincula, quibus cum sodalibus religiosae familiae sociisque laboris episcopis, iungebatur, abrumpere, diuturnis conflictari molestiis, omne genus angustiis premi. Gravissimis enim odiis ac periculis circumseptum locum expertus est Angliam, ubi enixe illi obsistendum fuit regibus ac principibus, quorum arbitrio erant Ecclesiae sortes gentiumque permissae; ignavis aut indignis officio sacro ministris; optimatibus plebique rerum omnium ignaris atque in pessima quaeque vitia ruentibus; imminuto nunquam ardore, quo fidei, morum, Ecclesiae disciplinae ac libertatis, eiusque propterea doctrinae ac sanctitatis exstitit vindex; plane dignus hoc altero memorati Pachalis praeconio: "Deo autem gratias, quia in te semper episcopalis auctoritas perseverat, et inter barbaros positus, non tyrannorum violentia, non potentum gratia, non incensione ignis, non effusione manus a veritatis annuntiatione desistis." Et rursus: "Exultamus," inquit, "quia gratia Dei tibi praestante auxilium, te nec minae concutiant nec promissa sustollunt." (In lib. III. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 44 et 74.)

Ex his omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, aequum est Nos etiam cum Decessore Nostro Paschali, lapsis ab illa aetate saeculis octo, laetitia percipere, eiusque voci resonare, gratias Deo persolventes. Simul vero cohortari vos iuvat ad hoc sanctitatis doctrinaeque lumen intuendum, quod, in Italia ortum vallis effudit plus annos triginta; Anglis supra quindecim; Ecclesiae denique universae communi praesidio ac decori fuit.

Quod si *opere et sermone* excelluit Anselmus, hoc est, si vitae pariter doctrinae quae palaestra, si contemplandi vi et agendi alacritate, si dimicando fortiter et sectando pacem suaviter, splendidos Ecclesiae triumphos comparavit et insignia in civilem societatem beneficia contulit, haec omnia ex eo sunt repetenda, quod in omni vitae cursu doctrinaeque ministerio Christo et Ecclesiae quam firmissime adhaeserit.

Haec mentibus defigenda curantes in tanti Doctoris commemoratione solemnī praeclara inde hauriemus, Venerabiles Fratres, et quae admiremur et quae imitemur exempla. Plurimum quoque ex ea contemplatione accedet roboris ac solatii ad sacri ministerii partes, arduas plerumque ac sollicitudinis plenas, viriliter explendas, ad impense curandum ut omnia instaurentur in Christo, ut in omnibus “formetur Christus” (Galat. iv., 19), maxime in iis, qui in spem sacerdotii succrescunt; ad constanter propugnandum Ecclesiae magisterium, ad obnitendum strenue pro Christi sponsae libertate, pro sancitate iuris divinitus constituti, pro iis denique omnibus, quaecumque sacri Principatus defensio postulat.

Nec enim vos latet, Venerabiles Fratres, quod saepe Nobiscum complorastis, quam tristitia sint in quae incidimus tempora, et rerum Nostrarum quam sit iniqua conditio. Ipsiūs doloris, quem ex publicis infortuniis incredibilem cepimus, refricatum est vulnus probrosis criminatiobus clero conflatis, quasi segnem, adiutorem in ea se calamitate praeberit; interiectis impedimentis ne benefica Ecclesiae virtus pateret miseris filiis; eius ipsa materna cura et providentia contempta. Alia plura silemus, quae in Ecclesiae perniciem aut versute et callide agitata sunt, aut nefario ausu patrata, publici violatione iuris, atque omni naturalis aequitatis et iustitiae lege despecta. Idque iis in locis accidisse gravissimum est, in quae illatae ab Ecclesia humanitatis abundantior amnis influxit. Quid enim tam inhumanum quam ut e filiis, quos Ecclesia quasi primogetos aluit fovitque in ipso suo vel flore vel robore non dubitent quidam in Matris amantissimae sinum sua tela converlere.

Nec est cur admodum recreet aliarum conditio regionum, ubi varia quidem belli facies est, furor idem, aut iam exardescens, aut ex occultae coniurationis tenebris mox erupturus. Hoc enim est consiliorum ultimum, apud gentes in quas maiora christianae religionis beneficia promanarunt, omnibus iuribus Ecclesiam despoliare; cum ipsa sic agere, quasi non sit genere ac iure perfecta societas, qualem naturae nostrae Reparator instituit; huius regnum excindere, quod etsi praecipue ac directo animos attingit, haud minus ad horum sempiternam salutem quam ad civilis utilitatis incolumitatem pertinet; omnio moliri, ut imperantis Dei loco effrena dominetur, mentito liberatis nomine licentia. Dumque id assequantur, ut per

dominatum vitiorum et cupiditatum pessima omnium instauretur servitus, ac praecipiti cursu cives ad extrema delabantur; "miseros autem facit populos peccatum" (Prov. xiv., 34), clamitare non cessant: "nolumus hunc regnare super nos." (Luc. xix., 14.) Hinc religiosorum sodalium sublatae familiae, quae magno semper Ecclesiae praesidio atque ornamento fuerunt, et humanitatis doctrinaeque sive inter barbaras gentes sive inter excultas provehendae principes exstiterunt hinc prostrata et afflicta christianae beneficentiae instituta; hinc habiti ludibrio sacri ordinis viri, quibus aut ita obsistitur ut eorum plane concidant vires, aut ad publica magisteria vel omnino intercluditur vel satis impeditur iter; aut in institutione iuventutis nullae relictæ sunt partes; hinc christiana omnis actio publicae utilitatis intercepta; egregii e populo viri catholicam fidem apertius profitentes, nullo in honore numerove positi, procacibus iniuriis lacessiti, exagitati quasi genus infimum atque abiectissimum, serius ocus visuri diem, quo, recrudescente hostili vi legum, nec sibi licebit in rebus ullis misceri, quibus publica vitae actio continetur. Huius interim auctores belli, tam atrociter calideque suscepti, non alia dictitant se causa moveri, nisi libertatis amore ac studio provehendae humanitatis, quin etiam patriae caritate, haud secus mentiti atque ipsorum parens, qui "homicida erat ab initio," qui "cum loquitur mendacium, ex propriis loquitur, quia mendax est" (Igan. viii., 44), et in Deum atque in hominum genus inexpressibili odio succensus. Protervae sane frontis homines, qui verba dare nituntur et incautis auribus insidias facere. Nec enim eos dulcis amor patriae aut anxia de populo cura, aut ulla recti honestique species ad nefarium bellum impellunt, sed vesanus in Deum furor in eiusque admirandum opus, Ecclesiam. Ex concepto eiusmodi odio, tamquam ex venenato fonte, scelerata illa consilia erumpunt Ecclesiae opprimendae summovendaeque a coniunctione societatis humanae; inde ignobiles voces clamitantium eam esse demortuam, quam nihilominus oppugnare non desinunt; quin etiam eae audaciae insaniaeque procedunt, ut omni libertate spoliata criminari non dubitent quod in hominum genus, quod in rempublicam utilitatis conferat nihil. Idem infensus animus efficit, ut illustriora Ecclesiae atque Apostolicae Sedis beneficia vel astute dissimulent, vel silentio praeterant; forte etiam occasionem arripiant iniiciendae suspicionis et influendi callido artificio in aures animosque multitudinis acta dictave singula Ecclesiae aucupantes eaque traducentes quasi totidem impendentia civitati pericula, quum contra dubitari non possit, quin germanae libertatis et exquisitioris humanitatis incrementa a Christo maxime per Ecclesiam, profecta sint.

In huius impetum belli, ab externis hostibus illati, a quibus "alibi quidem acie apertaue dimicatione, astu alibi abstrusisque insidiis,

attamen ubique Ecclesiam oppugnari conspiciamus," ut vigiles essent curae vestrae conversae, Venerabiles Fratres, quum saepe alias tum vos praecipue monuimus allocutione in sacro Consistorio habita XVII. Cal. Ianuarias anno MDCCCCVII.

Verum haud severe minus quam dolenter denuntiandum cohibendumque Nobis est aliud belli genus, intestini quidem ac domestici, sed eo funestioris quo latet occultius. Hanc machinati sunt pestem perditum quidam filii, in ipso Ecclesiae sinu delitescetes ut eum dilacerent. Horum tela in Ecclesiae animam, tamquam in trunci radicem, coniiciuntur ut certo ictu ac destinato feriant. Est enim ipsis propositum christianae vitae doctrinaeque turbare fontes; sacrum fidei depositum diripere; per pontificiae auctoritatis et episcoporum contemptum divinae institutionis fundamenta convellere; novam Ecclesiae formam imponere, novas leges, nova iura describere, prout pessimorum quas profitentur opinionum portenta desiderant; totam denique divinae Sponsae deformare faciem vano fulgore percussi recentioris cuiusdam humanitatis, hoc est, falsi nominis scientiae, a qua cavere interato nos iubet Apostolus his verbis: "Videte ne quis vos decipiat per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam secundum traditionem hominum, secundum elementa mundi et non secundum Christum." (Colos. ii., 8.)

Hac philosophiae specie atque inani eruditionis fallacia, ad ostentationem parata et cum summa iudicandi audacia coniuncta, capti nonnulli "evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis (Rom. i., 21), et, "bonam conscientiam . . . repellentes, circa fidem naufragaverunt" (I. Tim. i., 19); alii ancipiti cogitatione distracti, opinionum quasi fluctibus obruuntur, nec ipsi sciunt ad quod litus appellant; alii otio et litteris abutentes, difficiles nugae inani labore consecretantur; quo fit ut a studio rerum divinarum et a sinceris doctrinae fontibus abducantur. Neque vero exitiosa ista labes, quae ab incensa morbosae novitatis libidine *modernismi* nomen accepit, etsi denuntiata saepius, et ipsa fautorum intemperantia suis integumentis nudata, cessat gravi detrimento esse christianae reipublicae. Latet virus inclusum in venis atque in visceribus huius nostrae societatis, quae a Christo et ab Ecclesia descivit; maxime vero *uti cancer* serpit inter succrescentem soborem, cui et rerum experientia minima est et insita ingenio temeritas. Nam, cur ita se gerant, non ea sane causa est quod solida polleant exquisitaque doctrina; siquidem rationem inter et fidem nulla potest esse vera dissensio (Concil. Vatic. Constit. Dei filius, cap. 4) sed quod ipsi de se mirabiliter sentiunt; quod pestifero quodam huius aetatis afflati spiritu, sup impuro quasi caelo crassoque vivunt; quod rerum sacrarum cognitionem, quam aut nullam habent aut confusam atque permixtam, stulta cum arrogantia coniungunt. Cui contagioni fovendae sublata in Deum fides ab eoque defectio

alimenta suppeditant. Nam quos caeca ista novarum rerum libido transversos agit, ii facile putant satis esse sibi virium, ut, vel aperte vel simulate, iugum omne divinae auctoritatis excutiant et religionem sibi fingant iuris naturae finibus fere circumscriptam ac suo cuiusque ingenio accommodatam, quae christianae speciem nomenque mutuetur, re autem ab ipsius vita et veritate quam longissime abest.

Atque ita ex aeterno bello adversus divina omnia suscepto nova bella seruntur, mutata dimicandi ratione; idque eo periculosius, quo callidiora sunt arma fictae pietatis, ingenui candoris, incensae voluntatis, qua factiosi homines nituntur amice componere res disiunctissimas, hoc est labilis humanae scientiae deliramenta cum fide divina, et cum saeculi nutantis ingenio Ecclesiae dignitatem atque constantiam.

Haec Nobiscum conquesti, Venerabiles Fratres, non idcirco animum despondetis nec spem omnem abiicitis. Compertum vobis est, quam gravia christianae reipublicae certamina remotiores aetates, quamquam huic nostrae dissimiles, attulerint. Qua in re iuverit in Anselmi tempora mentem animumque referre, quantum ex annalibus constat, sane difficillima. Fuit enim vere dimicandum pro aris et focus, hoc est, pro publici sanctitate iuris, pro libertate, humanitate, doctrina, quarum rerum tutela uni erat Ecclesiae commissa; cohibenda principum vis, quibus commune erat ius et fas omne miscere; extirpanda vitia, excolendae mentes, ad civilem cultum revocandi homines, veteris immanitatis nondum obliti; excitanda cleri pars aut remissius agentis aut intemperantius; cuius ordinis haud pauci, principum arbitrio et pravis artibus electi, horum dominatui tamquam servi subesse atque in omnibus morigerari solerent.

Hic erat rerum status in iis maxime regionibus, quibus in iuvandis maiorem Anselmus operam curaque collocavit, sive doctoris magisterio, sive exemplo religiosae vitae, sive Archiepiscopi ac Primatis assidua vigilantia et industria multiplici. Eius namque singularia beneficia in primis expertae sunt Galliae provinciae ac Britannicae insulae, paucis ante saeculis illae in potestatem redactae Normanorum hae in sinum Ecclesiae receptae. Utraque gens, crebris agitata seditionibus externisque bellis divexata, causam relaxandae disciplinae, quum principibus eorumque imperio subiectis, tum clero populoque attulerunt.

His de rebus graviter queri numquam destiterunt eius aevi summi viri, quo in numero vetus Anselmi magister idemque in Cantuariensi sede decessor, Lanfrancus; at potissimum Romani Pontifices, quorum unum commemorasse sit satis, invicto animi robore virum, iustitiae propugnatorem impavidum, Ecclesiae iurium ac libertatis constantem adsertorem, per vigilem disciplinae cleri custodem ac

vindicem, Gregorium septimum. Horum studia et exempla aemulatus Anselmus, doloris vocem altius attollens, ad suae principem gentis, qui ipso propinquo et amico gloriari solebat, haec scribit: "Videtis, mi charissime domine, qualiter mater nostra Ecclesia Dei, quam Deus pulchram amicam et dilectam sponsam suam vocat, a malis principibus conculcatur; quomodo ab his, quibus ut advocatis ad tuitionem a Deo commendata est, ad eorum aeternam damnationem tribulatur; qua praesumptione in proprios usus ipsi usurpaverunt res eius; qua crudelitate in servitutem redigunt libertatem eius; qua impietate contemnunt et dissipant legem et religionem eius. Qui cum dedignantur Apostolici decretis (quae ad robur christianae religionis facit) esse obedientes, Petro utique apostolo, cuius vice fungitur, imo Christo, qui Petro commendavit suam Ecclesiam, se probant esse inobedientes. . . . Omnes namque qui nolunt subiecti esse legi Dei, absque dubio deputantur inimici Dei." (Epist., lib. iii., ep. 65.) Haec Anselmus; cuius utinam voces pronis auribus exceperissent, non modo qui fortissimo illi principi successerunt, eiusque nepotes, verum etiam alii reges ac populi, quos tanto amore complexus est, tot praesidiis communivit ac beneficiis exornavit.

Tantum interim abfuit ut in eum excitatae molestiarum procellae, direptiones, exsilia, conflictationes, praesertim in episcopi munere, virtutis eius nervos eliderent, ut ipsum Ecclesiae atque Apostolicae Sedi arctius devinxerint. Quare ad memoratum Pontificem Paschalem scribens, angustiis pressus curisque distentus: "non timeo," inquit, "exilium, non paupertatem, non tormenta, non mortem, quia ad haec omnia. Deo confortante, paratum est cor meum pro Apostolicae Sedis obedientia et Matris meae Ecclesiae Christi libertate." (Epist., lib. iii., ep. 73.) Ad patrocinium et opem Cathedrae Petri confugit, eo consilio, "ne umquam religionis ecclesiasticae et apostolicae auctoritatis constantia aliquatenus per me aut propter me debilitetur," prout litteris datis ad illustres Ecclesiae Romanae antistites duos ipse significat. Rationem autem causamque subiicit, in qua pastoralis fortitudinis ac dignitatis conspicua Nobis eminent nota: "Malo enim mori et, quamdiu vivam, omni penuria in exilio gravari, quam ut videam honestatem Ecclesiae Dei, causa mei aut meo exemplo, ullo modo violari." (Epist., lib. iv., ep. 47.)

Ecclesiae igitur honestas illa, libertas, integritas, tria haec dies noctesque sancti Viri obversantur animo; pro harum incolumitate Deum effusis lacrimis, precibus, sacrificiis fatigat; his provehendis vires omnes intendit et resistendo acriter et patiando viriliter; haec actione, scriptis, voce tuetur. Ad eam defensionem sodales religiosos, antistites, clerum populumque fidelem suavis iisque gravibus excitat verbis (usus etiam severioribus in eos principes, qui

Ecclesiae iura et libertatem ingenti cum sua suorumque iactura proculcarent.

Nobiles illae sacrae libertatis voces, quum valde hoc tempore opportunaee, tum dignae plane sunt iis, quos "Spiritus Sanctus posuit episcopos regere Ecclesiam Dei" (Act. xx., 28), ne tum quidem fructu vacuae quum, vel ob intermortuam fidem vel collapsos mores vel praeiudicatas opiniones, obseratis auribus excipiuntur. Ad nos potissimum, Venerabiles Fratres, uti probe nostis, divina illa monitio refertur: "Clama, ne cesses, quasi tuba exalta vocem tuam" (Isai lviii., 1); idque maxime ubi etiam "Altissimus dedit vocem suam" (Ps. xvii., 14, per naturae fremitum terrificasque calamitates, expressam; vocem "Domini concutientis terram;" ingratam nostris auribus vocem alte insonantem, quod aeternum non sit, nihil esse; "Non enim habemus his manentem civitatem, sed futuram inquirimus" (Hebr. xiii., 14); iustitiae vocem pariterque misericordiae, devias nationes ad recti bonique tramitem revocantis. In huiusmodi publicis infortuniis altius nobis extollenda vox est; grandia fidei documenta non infimis modo inculcanda, sed summis et beate viventibus et gentium arbitris et adscitis in consilia regendarum civitatum; proponendae omnibus firmissimae illae sententiae, quarum veritatem cruentis historia notis confirmavit, cuius generis haec: "Miseros autem facit populos peccatum." (Prov. xiv., 34.) "Potentes autem potenter tormenta patientur (Sap. vi., 7); atque item quod est in Ps. II.: "Et nunc reges intelligite, erudimini qui iudicatis terram. . . . Apprehendite disciplinam, ne quando irascatur Dominus, et pereatis de via iusta." Harum autem comminationum exitus expectandi sunt acerbissimi, quum publica grassatur iniquitas, quum ab iis qui praesunt et a reliquis civibus in eo delinquitur maxime, quod e medio pellitur Deus et a Christi Ecclesia desciscitur; qua ex duplici aversione rerum omnium perturbatio sequitur et infinita prope miseriarum seges quum singulis tum universae reipublicae.

Quod si talium scelerum affines esse silendo et acquiescendo possumus prout non raro fit etiam a bonis sacri pastores sibi quisque dicta putent aliisque opportune commendent quae ad potentissimum Flandriae principem ab Anselmo scripta leguntur: "Precor, obsecro, moneo, consulo, ut fidelis animae vestrae, mi Domine, et ut in Deo vere dilecte, ut nunquam aestimetis vestrae celsitudinis minui dignitatem, si sponsae Dei et matris vestrae Ecclesiae amatis et defenditis libertatem; nec putetis vos humiliari, si eam exaltatis, nec credatis vos debilitari si eam roboratis, Videte, circumspicite; exempla sunt in promptu; considerate principes qui illam impugnant et conculcant, ad quid proficiunt, ad quid deveniunt? Satis patet; non eget dictu." (Epist., lib iv., ep. 12.) Quod idem luculentius etiam expressit, pari vi ac suavitate verborum, his ad Balduinum regem.

Hierosolymitanum scriptis: "Ut fidelissimus amicus precor vos, moneo obsecro et Deum oro quatenus sub lege Dei vivendo voluntatem vestram coluntati Dei per omnia subdatis. Tunc enim vere regnatis ad vestram utilitatem, si regnatis secundum Dei voluntatem. Ne putetis vobis, sicut multi mali reges faciunt, Ecclesiam Dei quasi domino ad serviendum esse datam, sed sicut advocato et defensori esse commendatam. *Nihil magis diligit Deus in hoc mundo quam libertatem ecclesiae suae.* Qui ei volunt non tam prodesse quam dominari, procul dubio Deo probantur adversari. Liberam vult esse Deus sponsam suam, non ancillam. Qui eam sicut filii matrem tractant et honorant, vere se filios eius et filios Dei esse probant. Qui vero illi quasi subditae dominantur, non filios, sed alienos se faciunt, et ideo iuste ab haereditate et dote illi promissa exhaeredantur." (Epist., ep. 8.) Ita e sancto viri pectore fervidus in Ecclesiam amor erumpit; ita eminet studium libertatis tuendae, qua nihil est magis in gerenda christiana republica necessarium, nihil Deo carius, ut ab eodem egregio Doctore affirmatum est brevi illa et vibranti sententia: "*nihil magis diligit Deus in hoc mundo quam libertatem Ecclesiae suae.*" Nec est quidquam, Venerabiles Fratres, quo mens animusque Noster pateat apertius, quam verborum quae retulimus crebra usurpatio.

Ab ipso pariter mutuari monita libet ad principes proceresque conversa. Sic enim ad reginam Angliae Matildam scribit: "Si recte, si bene, si efficaciter ipso actu vultis reddere grates, considerate reginam illam quam de mundo hoc sponsam sibi illi placuit eligere. . . . Hanc, inquam, considerate . . . hanc exaltate, honorate, defendite, ut cum illa et in illa sponsa Deo placeatis et in aeterna beatitudine cum illa regnando vivatis." (Epist., lib. iii., ep. 57.) Tum vero maxime quum in filium aliquem terrena potestate inflatum incideritis, aut amantissimae Matris oblitum, aut suave eius imperium detrectantem, haec memoria ne excidant: "Ad vos pertinet . . . ut haec et huiusmodi . . . frequenter opportune importune suggeratis; et ut non dominum, sed advocatum, non privignum, sed filium se probet esse Ecclesiae consulatis." (Epist., ep. 59.) Nostri namque muneris est, idque praecipue nos decet, alia haec nobili paternoque sensu ab Anselmo dicta suadere atque in hominum animis defigenda curare: "Cum audio aliquid de vobis quod Deo non placet et vobis non expedit, si vos monere negligo, nec Deum timeo, nec vos diligo sicut debeo." (Epist., lib. iv., ep. 52.) Si autem auditum sit nobis "quia ecclesias, quae in manu vestra sunt, aliter tractatis quam illis expediat et animae vestrae," tunc, Anselmum imitati, debemus iterum rogare et consulere et monere, "ut haec non negligenter mente pertractetis, et si quid vobis conscientia vestra in his corrigendum testabitur, corrigere festinetis."

(Epist., lib. iv., ep. 32.) "Nihil enim est contemnendum quod corrigi possit, quid Deus exigit ab omnibus, non solum quod male agunt, sed etiam quod non corrigunt mala quae corrigere possunt. Et quanto potentiores sunt ut corrigant, tanto districtius exigit ab illis Deus, ut secundum potestatem misericorditer impensam bene velint et faciant. . . . Si autem non omnia simul potestis, non debetis propter hoc quin a melioribus ad meliora studeatis proficere, quia bona proposita et bonos conatus Deus solet benigne perficere et beata plenitudine retribuere." (Epist., lib. iii., ep. 142.)

Haec aliaque id genus, ab ipso fortiter sapienterque regum et potentissimorum hominum auribus inculcata, sacris pastoribus Ecclesiaeque principibus apprime conveniunt, quibus veritatis, iustitiae, religionis est commissa defensio. Multa quidem attulit impedimenta dies, totque Nobis iniecti sunt laquei, ut iam vix reliquus sit locus ubi liceat expedite ac tuto versari. Dum enim impunitae rerum omnium licentiae fraena remittuntur, acri pertinacia compedibus Ecclesia constringitur, et, retento ad ludibrium libertatis nomine, novis in dies artibus omnis vestra clerique actio praepeditur, ita ut nihil habeat admirationis, *quod non omnia simul potestis* ad homines ab errore et vitiis revocandos, ad malas consuetudines removendas, ad veri rectique notiones in mentibus inserendas, ad Ecclesiam denique tot pressam angustiis relevandam.

Sed est cur animum erigamus. Vivit enim Dominus efficietque ut "diligentibus Deum omnia cooperentur in bonum." (Rom. viii., 28.) Ipse a malis bona derivabit, eo splendidiore largiturus Ecclesiae triumphos, quo pervicacius nisa est opus Eius intercipere humana perversitas. Est hoc admirabile divinae Providentiae consilium; hae sunt in praesenti rerum ordine "investigabiles vestrae, viae meae, dicit Dominus" (Rom. xi., 33), ut "meae cogitationes vestrae, neque viae vestrae, viae meae, dicit Dominus" (Isai. lv., 8), ut ad Christi similitudinem Ecclesia in dies propius accedat et expressam referat Ipsius imaginem, tot ac tanta perpassi, ita ut quodammodo adimpleat "ea quae desunt passionum Christi." (Coloss. i., 24.) Quocirca eidem in terris militanti haec est divinitus constituta lex, ut contentionibus, molestiis, angustiis perpetuo exerceatur, quo vitae genere queat "per multas tribulationes . . . intrare in regnum Dei" (Act. xiv., 21), et Ecclesiae in caelo triumphanti tandem aliquando se adiungere.

Ad rem Anselmus Matthaei locum illum: "Compulit Iesus discipulos suos ascendere in naviculam," sic explanat: "Iuxta mysticam intelligentiam summatim describitur Ecclesiae status ab adventu Salvatoris usque ad finem saeculi. . . . Navis igitur *in medio maris iactabatur fluctibus*, dum Iesus in montis cacumine moraretur; quia ex quo Salvator in caelum ascendit, sancta Ecclesia magnis

tribulationibus in hoc mundo agitata est, et variis persecutionum turbinibus pulsata, ac diversis malorum hominum pravitatibus vexata, vitiisque multimode tentata. *Erat enim ei contrarius ventus, quia flatus malignorum spirituum ei semper adversatur, ne ad portum salutis perveniat; obruere eam nititur fluctibus adversitatum saeculi, omnes quas valet contrariedades ei commovens.*" (Hom. iii.)

Vehementer igitur errant qui Ecclesiae statum sibi fingunt ac sperant omnium perturbationum expertem, in quo, rebus ad voluntatem fluentibus, nullo repugnante sacrae potestatis auctoritati atque imperio, frui liceat quasi otio iucundissimo. Turpius etiam decipiuntur qui, falsa et inani spe ducti potiundae huiusmodi pacis, Ecclesiae res et iura dissimulant, privatis rationibus postponunt, iniuste demineant, mundo, qui *totus in maligno positus est* assentantur per speciem captandae gratiae fautorum novitatis et conciliandae iisdem Ecclesiae, quasi lucis cum tenebris aut Christi cum Belial ulla possit esse conventio. Sunt haec aegri somnia, quorum vanae species fingi nunquam desierunt, nec desinent quamdiu aut ignavi milites erunt, qui, simul ac viderint hostem, abiecto scuto fugiant, aut proditores, qui festinent cum inimico pacisci, hoc est in re nostra, cum Dei atque humani generis hoste infensissimo.

Vestrum igitur est, Venerabiles Fratres, quos christianae plebis pastores ac duces divina Providentia constituit, curare pro viribus ut in pravum hunc morem prona aetas omittat, flagrante tam saevo in Religionem bello, turpi socordia torpescere, neutris in partibus esse, per ambages et compromissa divina atque humana iura pervertere, insculptamque in animo retineat certam illam ac definitam Christi sententiam: "Qui non est mecum, contra me est." (Matth. xii., 30.) Non quod paterna caritate abundare minime oporteat Christi ministros, ad quos maxime pertinent Pauli verba: "omnibus omnia factus sum, ut omnes facerem salvos" (I. Cor. ix., 22), aut quod nunquam deceat paullum etiam de suo iure decedere, quantum liceat et animorum postulet salus. Offensionis huius nulla cadit in vos certe suspicio, quos Christi caritas urget. Verum aequa ista deditio nullam habet violati officii reprehensionem, atque aeterna veritatis et iustitiae fundamenta ne minimum quidem attingit.

Sic nempe factum legimus in Anselmi, seu potius in Dei Ecclesiaeque causa, pro qua, illi tamdiu fuit ac tam aspere dimicandum. Itaque, composito tandem diuturno dissidio, Decessor Noster, quem saepe memoravimus, Paschalis, his cum verbis extollit: "Hoc nimirum tuae caritatis gratia tuarumque orationum instantia factum credimus, ut in hac parte populum illum, cui tua sollicitudo praesidet, miseratio superna respiceret." De paterna vero indulgentia, qua idem Summus Pontifex sotes excepit, haec habet: "Quod autem . . . adeo condescendimus, eo affectu et compassione factum

noveris, ut eos qui iacebant erigere valeamus. Qui enim stans iacenti ad sublevandum manum porrigit, nunquam iacentem eriget, nisi et ipse curvetur. Ceterum, quamvis casui propinquare inclinatio videatur, statum tamen rectitudinis non amittit." (In libro iii., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 140.)

Haec Nobis vindicantes a piissimo Decessore Nostro ad Anselmi solatium prolata, dissimulare nolumus tamen anxias animi dubitationes, quibus vel optimi inter sacros pastores aliquando distinentur in incipiti consilio aut remissius agendi aut resistendi constantius. Cuius rei argumento esse possunt angores, trepidationes, lacrimae sanctissimorum hominum, quibus magis explorata erat animorum regiminis gravitas receptique in se periculi magnitudo. Luculentum vero testimonium Anselmi vita suppeditat, cui a grato pietatis et studiorum secessu, ad amplissima munia, difficillimis temporibus, uti diximus, adscito, fuerunt acerbissima quaeque subeunda. Cumque tot curis esset implicitus, nihil magis verebatur, quam ne suae populiue saluti, Dei honori, Ecclesiae dignitati satis foret per se consultum. His autem cogitationibus conflictatum animum, eundemque propter defectionem plurimorum, e numero etiam sacrorum antistitum, gravi dolore incensum nihil magis recreabat, quam collocata in Dei ope fiducia et quaesitum in Ecclesiae sinu perfugium. Itaque "in naufragio positus . . . procellis irruentibus, ad sinum matris Ecclesiae" confugiebat, a Romano Pontifice petens "pium et promptum adiutorium et solamen." (Epist., lib. iii., ep. 37.) Divino autem fortasse consilio factum est, ut singulari sapientia et sanctitate vir tot adversis urgeretur. Per eas enim aerumnas exemplo ac solatio nobis esse potuit in sacro ministerio laborantibus et in maximas difficultates coniectis, ita ut unicuique nostrum liceat idem sentire ac velle quod Paulus: "Libenter . . . gloriabor in infirmitatibus meis, ut inhabitet in me virtus Christi. Propter quod placeo mihi in infirmitatibus meis . . .; cum enim infirmor, tunc potens sum." (II. Cor. xii., 9, 10.) His non aliena sunt quae ad Urbanum II. scribit Anselmus: "Sancte Pater, doleo me esse quod sum, doleo me non esse quod fui. Doleo me esse episcopum, quia peccatis meis facientibus non ago episcopi officium. In loco humili aliquid agere videbar; in sublimi positus praegrandi onere pressus; nec mihi fructum facio, nec utilis alicui existo. Oneri quidem succumbo, quia virium, virtutum, industriae, scientiae tanto officio competentium inopiam, plusquam credibile videatur, patior. Curam importabilem cupio fugere, pondus relinquere; Deum e contrario timeo offendere. Timor Dei illud me suscipere compellit, timor idem onus idem me retinere compellit. . . . Nunc, quia voluntas Dei me latet, et quid agam nescio, errabundus suspiro, et quem rei finem imponere debeam ignoro." (Epist., lib. iii., ep. 37.)

Divinae sic bonitati placuit, vel eximiae sanctitatis viros non ignorare, quae sua sit naturalis infirmitas, ut persuasum sit omnibus, si quid ipsi praeclare egerint, id supernae virtuti esse totum tribuendum, atque ut per animi demissionem adducantur homines ad Ecclesiae auctoritatem impensiore studio colendam. Id Anselmo alisque contigit episcopis pro Ecclesiae libertate ac doctrina dimicantibus, duce Sede Apostolica; qui obedientiae suae hunc fructum retulerunt, ut ex certamine victores discederent, suoque exemplo divinam sententiam confirmarent: “vir obediens loquetur victoriam.” (Prov. xxi., 28.) Consequendi autem huiusmodi praemii spes maxima illis affulget, qui Christi personam gerenti sincero animo pareant in iis omnibus, quae aut regimen animorum spectent aut administrationem christianae reipublicae aut alia cum his aliqua ratione coniuncta; “quoniam de Sedis Apostolicae auctoritate pendent filiorum Ecclesiae directiones et consilia.” (Epist., lib. iv., ep. 1.)

Hoc genere laudis Anselmus quantum praestiterit, quo ardore, qua fide coniunctionem cum Petri Sede retinuerit, ex his licet colligere, quae ad eundem Paschalem Pontificem ab eo scripta leguntur: “Quanto studio mens mea Sedis Apostolicae reverentiam et obedientiam pro sua possibilitate amplectatur, testantur multae et gravissimae tribulationes cordis mei, soli Deo et mihi notae. . . . A qua intentione spero in Deo, quia nihil est quod me retrahere possit. Quapropter in quantum mihi possibile est, omnes actus meos eiusdem auctoritatis dispositioni dirigendos, et ubi opus est, corrigendos volo committere.” (Epist., lib. iv., ep. 5.)

Eandem viri firmissimam voluntatem acta eius omni et scripta testantur, in primisque litterae illae suavissimae, quas “caritatis calamo scriptas” (In lib. iii., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 74) dicit memoratus Decessor Noster Paschalis. Nec vero suis ipse litteris pium modo “adiutorium et solamen implorat (In lib. iii., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 37) sed non intermissas preces adhibiturum se Deo pollicetur, ut cum ad Urbanum II. Beccensis Abbas scriberet his verbis amantissimis usus: “Pro vestra et Romanae Ecclesiae tribulatione, quae nostra et omnium vere fidelium est, non cessamus orare Deum assidue, ut mitiget vobis a diebus malis, donec fodiatur peccatori fovea. Et certi sumus, etiam num nobis moram videatur facere, quoniam non relinquet virgam peccatorum super sortem iustorum; quia haereditatem suam non derelinquet, et portae inferi non praevalerunt adversus eam.” (In libro ii., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 33.)

Quibus aliisque id genus ab Anselmo scriptis mirifice delectamur, tum ob instauratam viri memoriam, quo nemo sane huic Apostolicae Sedi devinctior, tum ob excitatam recordationem coniunctissimae voluntatis vestrae, Venerabiles Fratres, in dimicationis non dispari genere, litteris aliisque officiis quamplurimis declaratae.

Mirum profecto quantum roboris ac firmitatis accepit, de saevientibus longo saeculorum cursu in christianum nomen procellis, coniunctionis ista necessitudine, qua sacrorum antistites et fidelis grex arctius in dies Romano Pontifici adhaeserunt ad haec usque tempora, quibus ardor ille adeo succrevit, ut divino quodam prodigio videantur voluntates hominum in tantum consensum potuisse coalescere. Quae quidem amoris et obsequii conspiratio dum Nos plurimum erigit planeque confirmat, Ecclesiae decori est ac praesidio validissimo. Sed hoc nempe maior in nos antiqui serpentis invidie conflatur, quo praestantius est delatum beneficium; eoque graviores in nos irae colliguntur impiorum hominum, quo acrius hi rei novitate percelluntur. Nec enim simile quidquam in reliquis consociationibus admirantur, nec facti rationem cernunt ullam, sive a publicis causis sive ab alia quavis humana re petitam, nec secum reputant sublimem Christi precationem, cum discipulis postremum discumbentis, eventu comprobata.

Summa igitur ope niti oportet, Venerabiles Fratres, ut apte cohaerentia cum capite membra solidiore in dies nexu obstringantur, divinarum rerum ratione habita, non terrestrium, ita ut omnes *unum simus* in Christo. Ad hunc finem si velis remisque contendemus, functi erimus optime delato nobis officio provehendi Christi operis et regni eius in terris dilatandi. Huc spectat suavis illa petitio, qua Ecclesia caelestem Sponsum urget assidue, in qua Nostrorum summa votorum continetur: "Pater sancte, serva eos in nomine tuo, quos dedisti mihi, ut sint unum sicut et nos." (Ioan. xvii., II.)

Haec autem industriae propositam habent defensionem, non modo contra externas impugnationes in acie dimicantium ut Ecclesiae iura et libertatem labefactent, sed etiam contra domestici atque intestini belli pericula cuius rei superius incidit mentio, quum dolumus esse genus hominum quoddam, qui subdolis opinionum commentis nitantur Ecclesiae formam ac naturam ipsam immutare penitus, doctrinae integritatem violare, disciplinam omnem pessumdare. Serpit adhuc per hos dies memoratum illud virus infecitque non paucos, etiam sacri ordinis homines, praesertim iuvenes, inquinato, uti diximus, quasi aere afflato, quos effrenata novitatis libido praecipites agit ac respirare non sinit.

Sunt etiam in his qui, tardioris ingenii et intemperantis animi spectaculum exhibentes, quidquid affert incrementi dies iis disciplinis quae in adspectabilis naturae investigatione versantur et ad praesentis vitae utilitatem aut commoditatem pertinent, ea, tamquam nova tela, in veritatem divinitus traditam, per summam astutiam et arrogantiam intorqueant. Hi meminerint, incautae novitatis fautorum quam variae fuerint ac discrepantes sententiae de rebus ad agnitionem animi et ad moderandam vitam plane necessariis, cogno-

scantque, hanc esse humanae superbiae constitutam poenam, ut constant sibi nunquam, et in ipso cursu ante obruantur, quam portum veritatis conspiciere potuerint. Sed hi fere ne ipso quidem sui exemplo didicerunt de se tandem sentire demissius atque amovere "consilia . . . et omnem altitudinem extollentem se adversus scientiam Dei, et in captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi." (II. Cor. x., 4, 5.)

Quin etiam a nimia arrogancia in contrarium vitium delapsi sunt, eam philosophandi rationem secuti, quae, de omnibus dubitando, quasi noctem quandam rebus offundit, et *agnosticismum* professi cum errorum comitatu multiplici atque infinita prope sententiarum varietate inter se mire pugnantium; quo opinionum conflictata "evanuerunt in cogitationibus suis . . . dicentes enim se esse sapientes, stulti facti sunt." (Rom., i., 21, 22.)

Grandibus interim ac fucatis istorum verbis, novam sapientiam quasi caelo delapsam reconditasque discendi vias pollicentium, iuvenum pars labare paulatim atque averti coepit; quod idem olim accidit Augustinò, manicheorum fraudibus circumvento. Verum de funestis hisce insanientis sapientiae magistris, de ipsorum ausibus, deceptionibus, fallaciis satis diximus in Encyclicis Litteris datis die VIII. mensis Septembris anno MDCCCCVII., quarum initium *Pascendi dominici gregis*.

Illud hoc loco animadvertisse iuverit, quae memoravimus pericula, graviora quidem nunc esse atque imminere propius; non tamen iis penitus absimilia quae Anselmi tempore Ecclesiae doctrinae impendebant. Considerandum praeterea pari propemodum nobis praesidio ac solatio esse posse Anselmi doctrinam ad tutelam veritatis, atque apostolicum eius robur ad Ecclesiae iurium ac libertatis defensionem.

Atque heic persequi omittentes quaenam remotae illius aetatis fuerit humanitatis, qui cleri populisque cultus, breviter attingemus creatum eo tempore ingeniis periculum duplex, eo quod in opposita extrema decurrerint.

Fuerunt enim inepti homines et vani, qui leviter ac permixte eruditi, cognitionum indigesta mole gloriarentur, inani philosophiae vel dialecticae specie decepti. Hi quidem per inanem fallaciam scientiae nomine obtectam, spernebant sacras auctoritates, "nefanda temeritate audent disputare contra aliquid eorum quae fides christiana confitetur, . . . et potius insipienti superbia iudicant nullatenus posse esse quod nequeunt intelligere, quam humili sapientia fateantur esse multa posse quae ipsi non valeant comprehendere . . . Solent enim quidam cum coeperint quasi cornua confidentis sibi scientiae producere, nescientes quod si quis aestimat se scire aliquid, nondum cognovit quemadmodum oporteat eum scire, antequam habeant per soliditatem fidei alas spiritales, praesumendo

in altissimas de fide quaestiones assurgere. Unde fit ut dum . . . praespostere prius per intellectum conantur escendere, in multimodos errores per intellectus defectum cogantur descendere." (S. Anselm., De Fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.) Atque horum similia exempla complura hodie quoque versantur ante oculos.

Alii contra, remissioris animi, multorum casu perculsi qui naufragium in fide fecerunt, et periculum veriti scientiae quae *inflat*, eo devenerunt ut omnem philosophiae usum, forte etiam solidam quamvis de sacris rebus disputationem defugerent.

Media inter utramque partem catholica consuetudo consistit, aequae aversata et priorum arrogantiam, a Gregorio IX. aevo insequenti reprehensam, qui "spiritu vanitatis ut uter distenti . . . fidem conantur plus debito ratione adstruere naturali . . . adulterantes verbum Dei philosophorum figmentis" (Gregor. IX., Epist. "Tacti dolore cordis." ad theologos Parisien, 7 Iul., 1228), et horum negligentiam, qui nulla investigandi veri cupiditate trahuntur, neque curant "per fidem ad intellectum proficere" (In libro II. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 41), praesertim si eorum officii ratio postulet catholicae fidei contra tot congestos errores defensionem.

Ad quam suscipiendam divinitus excitatus videtur Anselmus, ut exemplo, voce, scriptis tutum iter ostenderet, christianae sapientiae latites ad commune bonum derivaret, duxque esset ac norma doctoribus, qui post ipsum "sacras litteras scholastica methodo tradiderunt" (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis), quorum ipse praecursor merito est nuncupatus et habitus.

Quamquam haec non ita sunt accipienda quasi Augustanus doctor primo statim gressu fuerit philosophiae ac theologiae fastigia consequutus aut ad summorum virorum Thomae ac Bonaventurae famam processerit. Horum enim sapientiae seriores fructus multa dies et coniunctus magistrorum labor maturarunt. Ipsemet Anselmus, quae erat modestia sapientium propria, non minus quam celeritate ac subtilitate mentis, nihil a se scriptum edidit nisi oblata occasione, aut aliorum auctoritate compulsus, monetque constanter: "si quid diximus quod corrigendum sit, non renuo correctionem" (Cur Deus homo, lib. ii., cap. 23); quin etiam, ubi rescitra fidem posita sit et in quaestione versetur, non vult discipulum "sic his quae diximus inhaerere ut ea pertinaciter teneas, si quis validioribus argumentis haec destruere et diversa valuerit astruere; quod si contigerit, saltem ad exercitationem disputandi nobis haec profecisse non negabis." (De Grammatico, cap. 21 sub finem.)

Nihilominus multo plura est adeptus quam aut ipse speraret aut alius quisquam de se polliceretur. Adeo namque profecit, ut eorum qui sequuti sunt gloria nihil eius laudi detraxerit, ne ipsius quidem Thomae nobilitas, quamvis huic non omnia probata fuerint ab ipso

conclusa, alia etiam retractata sint planius atque perfectius. Anselmo tamen hoc maxime tribuendum, quod is investigationi straverit, viam, timidiorum suspiciones diluerit, incautos a periculis tutos praestiterit, pertinacium cavillatorum damna propulsaverit, qui ab ipso sic iure designantur: "illi . . . nostri temporis dialectici, imo dialectice haeretici" (De fide Trinitatis, cap 2), quorum intellectus esset suis deliramentis et ambitioni mancipatus.

De extremis hisce ait: "Quumque omnes, ut cautissime ad sacrae paginae quaestiones accedant, sint commonendi, illi utique nostri temporis dialectici . . . prorsus a spiritualium quaestionum disputatione sunt exsufflandi." Quam vero subdit ratio, apte cadit in hodiernos eorum imitatores, a quibus absurda illa recinuntur: "In eorum quippe animabus ratio, quae et princeps et iudex omnium debet esse quae sunt in homine, sic est in imaginationibus corporalibus obvoluta, ut ex eis se non possit evolvere nec ab ipsis ea, quae ipsa sola et pura contemplari debet, valet discernere." (De fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.) Nec aliena videntur huic tempori verba, quibus id genus philosophos ridet, "qui quoniam quod credunt intelligere non possunt, disputant contra eiusdem fidei a sanctis Patribus confirmatam veritatem; velut si vespertilliones et noctuae non nisi in nocte caelum videntes, de meridianis solis radiis disceptent contra aquilas solem ipsum irreverberato visu intuentes." (De fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.) Quapropter et hoc loco et alibi (In libro Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 41) depravatam eorum opinionem reprehendit, qui philosophiae plus aequo concedentes, ius illi adserebant theologiae campum pervadendi. Huic insaniae se opponens egregius Doctor suos cuique fines constituit utrique disciplinae, ac satis monet, quodnam sit munus et officium rationis naturalis in rebus quae doctrinam divinitus revelatam attingunt: "Fides . . . nostra," inquit, "contra impios ratione defendenda est." At quomodo et quousque? Verba quae sequuntur aperte declarant: "illis . . . rationabiliter ostendendum est quam irrationabiliter nos contemnant." (In libro Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 41.) Philosophiae igitur munus est praecipuum, in perspicuo ponere fidei nostrae *rationabile obsequium*, et, quod inde consequitur, officium adiungendae fidei auctoritati divinae altissima mysteria proponenti, quae plurimis testata veritatis indiciis, *credibilia facta sunt nimis*. Longe aliud ab hoc theologiae munus est, quae divina revelatione nititur et in fide solidiores efficit eos qui christiani nominis honore se gaudere fatentur; "nullus quippe christianus debet disputare quomodo, quod catholica Ecclesia corde credit et ore confitetur, non sit; sed semper eandem fidem indubitanter tenendo, amando et secundum illam vivendo, humiliter quantum potest, quaerere rationem quomodo sit. Si potest intelligere, Deo gratias agat; si non potest, non immittat cornua ad ventilan-

dum, sed submittat caput ad venerandum." (De fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.)

Quum igitur vel theologi quaerunt vel fideles petunt de fide nostra rationes, non his fundamentis, sed revelantis Dei auctoritate nituntur, hoc est, ut habet Anselmus: "sicut rectus ordo exigit ut profunda christianae fidei," quae mysteria dicuntur, "credamus priusquam ea praesumamus ratione discutere, ita negligentia mihi videtur, si, postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere." (Cur Deus homo, lib. i., cap. 2.) De illa profecto intelligentia loquitur, de qua Vaticana Synodus (Constit. Dei filius, cap 4); alio enim loco sic disserit: "Quamvis post Apostolos, sancti Patres et Doctores nostri multi tot et tanta de fidei nostrae ratione dicant, . . . non omnia quae possent, si diutius vixissent, dicere potuerunt, et veritatis ratio tam ampla tamque profunda est, ut a mortalibus nequeat exhauriri; et Dominus in Ecclesia sua, cum qua se esse usque ad consummationem saeculi promittit, gratiae suae dona non desinit impertiri. Et ut alia taceam, quibus sacra pagina nos ad investigandam rationem invitat, ubi dicit: nisi credideritis non intelligetis, aperte nos monet intentionem ad intellectum extendere, cum docet qualiter ad illum debeamus proficere." Nec est praetereunda ratio quam addit extremam: "inter fidem et speciem, intellectum, quem in hac vita capimus, esse medium," ideoque "quanto aliquis ad illum proficit, tanto eum propinquare speciei ad quam omnes anhaelamus." (De fide Trinitatis, Praefatio.)

Solida haec—ut alia praetereamus—per Anselmum philosophiae ac theologiae iacta sunt fundamenta; haec in posterorum usum ab ipso fuit studiorum ratio proposita, quam sequuti deinde sapientissimi viri *Scholasticorum* principes, in quibus maxime doctor Aquinas, magnis incrementis ditaverunt, illustrarunt, expoliverunt, ad eximium Ecclesiae decus atque praesidium. Haec autem de Anselmo commemorasse placuit, Venerabiles Fratres, quod optatam Nobis occasionem attulerunt vos iterum cohortandi ut saluberrimos christianae sapientiae fontes, ab Augustano doctore primum reclusos, ab Aquinate locupletatos uberrime, sacrae iuventuti pervios esse curetis. Qua in re memoria ne excidant quae Decessor Noster fel. rec. Leó XIII. (Encycl. "Aeterni Patris," diei 4 Augusti ann. MDCCCLXXIX.), Nosque ipsi documenta dedimus, quum saepe alias, tum etiam Encyclicis Litteris die VIII. mensis Septembris anno MDCCCXVII., quis initium "Pascendi dominici gregis." Patent heu nimium ruinae, quae, neglectis hisce studiis aut nec certa nec tuta via susceptis, effossae sunt, quum non pauci, etiam e clero, nec idonei nec parati, minime dubitarint "praesumendo in altissimas de fide quaestiones assurgere." (De fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.) Qua una cum Anselmo lugentes, eius verba usurpamus, ita graviter

monentis: "Nemo ergo se temere immergat in condensa divinarum questionum, nisi prius firmus sit in soliditate fidei, conquisita morum et sapientiae gravitate, ne per multiplicia sophismatum diverticula incauta levitate discurrens, aliqua tenaci illaqueetur falsitate." (De fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.) Cui levitati si faces accedant cupiditatum, ut fere fit, actum est de studiis gravioribus ac de integritate doctrinae. Inflati enim *insipiente superbia, qualem in haeretice dialecticis* dolet Anselmus, contemptui habent sacras auctoritates, id est divinas Litteras, Patres, Doctores, de quibus verecundioris ingenii iudicium non esse poterit aliud nisi hoc: "Nec nostris nec futuris temporibus ullum illis parem in veritatis contemplatione spe remus." (De fide Trinitatis, Praefatio.) Nec maiore in pretio habent Ecclesiae monita vel Pontificis Maximi, eos ad meliorem frugem revocare conantium, pro rebus dare verba solliciti et in fictum obsequium proni, quo fuco auctoritatem sibi et plurimorum gratiam concilient. Fore autem ut hi ad saniora consilia se referant vix ulla spes affulget, quod ei dicto audientes esse detrectent, cui "domino et Patri universae Ecclesiae in terra peregrinantis . . . divina Providentia . . . vitam et fidem christianam custodiendam et Ecclesiam suam regendam" commisit; ideoque "ad nullum alium rectius refertur, si quid contra catholicam fidem oritur in Ecclesia ut eius auctoritate corrigatur; nec ulli alii tutius, si quid contra errorem respondetur, ostenditur, ut eius prudentia examinetur." (De fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.) Atque utinam perduelles isti, qui se candidos, apertos, omnis officii retinentissimos, usu rerum et religionis praeditos, operosa fide pollentes tam facile profitentur, sapienter ab Anselmo dicta percipiant, eius exemplo institutoque se gerant, idque maxime in animo defigant: "Prius ergo fide mundandum est cor . . . et prius per praeceptorum Domini custodiam illuminandi, sunt oculi . . . et prius per humilem obedientiam testimoniorum Dei debemus fieri parvuli, ut discamus sapientiam. . . . Et non solum ad intelligendum altiora prohibetur mens ascendere sine fide et mandatorum Dei obedientia, sed etiam aliquando datus intellectus subtrahitur et fides ipsa subvertitur, neglecta bona conscientia." (De Fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.)

Quod si turbulenti homines ac protervi pergent causas errorum ac dissidii serere, doctrinae sacrae patrimonium diripere, violare disciplinam, venerandas consuetudines habere ludibrio, quas "velle convellere genus est haeresis" (S. Anselm., De nuptiis consanguineorum, cap. 1), ipsam denique divinam Ecclesiae constitutionem funditus evertere; iam videtis, Venerabiles Fratres, quam sit Nobis advigilandum ne tam dira pestis christianum gregem, adeoque teneriores foetus, inficiat. Hoc a Deo non intermissis precibus flagitamus, interposito Augustae Dei Matris patrocinio validissimo, deprecatori-

bus etiam adhibitis triumphantis Ecclesiae beatis civibus, praesertim Anselmo, christianae sapientiae fulgido lumine ac sacrorum iurium omnium incorrupto custode strenuoque vindice. Quem gratum est iisdem compellare sanctissimus Decessor Noster Gregorius VII.: "Quoniam fructuum tuorum bonus odor ad nos usque redoluit, quam dignas grates Deo referimus, et te in Christi dilectione ex corde amplectimur, credentes pro certo, tuorum studiorum exemplis Ecclesiam Dei in melius promoveri, et tuis similiumque tibi precibus etiam ab instantibus periculis, Christi subveniente misericordia, posse eripi. . . . Unde volumus tuam tuorumque fraternitatem assidue Deum orare, ut Ecclesiam suam et Nos, qui ei licet indigni praesidemus, ab instantibus haereticorum oppressionibus eripiat, et illos, errore dimisso, ad viam veritatis reducat." (In libro II. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 31.)

Talibus freti praesidiis et studio vestro confisi, apostolicam benedictionem, caelestis auspicem gratiae et singularis Nostrae benevolentiae testem, vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, universoque clero et populo singulis commisso peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, in festo S. Anselmi, die XXI. mensis Aprilis anno MDCCCXCIX, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

PIUS PP. X.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY FATHER PIUS X.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO ALL THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS AND
OTHER ORDINARIES IN PEACE AND COMMUNION WITH THE
APOSTOLIC SEE.

PIUS X. POPE.

Venerable Brothers, Health and the Apostolic Benediction.

AMID the general troubles of the time and the recent disasters at home which afflict us, there is surely consolation and comfort for us in that recent display of devotion of the whole Christian people which still continues to be "a spectacle to the world and to angels and to men" (I. Cor. iv., 9), and which, if it has now been called forth so generously by the advent of misfortune, has its one true cause in the charity of Our Lord Jesus Christ. For since there is not and there cannot be in the world any charity worthy of the name except through Christ, to Him alone must be attributed all the fruits of it, even in men of lax faith or hostile to religion, who are indebted for whatever vestiges of charity they may possess to the civilization introduced by Christ, which they have not yet succeeded in throwing off entirely and expelling from human society.

For this mighty movement of those who would console their Father and help their brethren in their public and private afflictions, words can hardly express our emotion and our gratitude. These feelings we have already made known on more than one occasion to individuals, but we cannot delay any longer to give a public expression of our thanks first of all to you, Venerable Brothers, and through you to all the faithful entrusted to your care.

So, too, we would make public profession of our gratitude for the many striking demonstrations of affection and reverence which have been offered us by our most beloved children in all parts of the world on the occasion of our sacerdotal jubilee. Most grateful have they been to us, not so much for our own sake as for the sake of religion and the Church, as being a profession of fearless faith and as it were a public manifestation of due honor to Christ and His Church, by the respect shown to him whom the Lord has placed over His family. Other fruits of the same kind, too, have greatly rejoiced us—the celebrations with which dioceses in North America have commemorated the centenary of their foundation, returning everlasting thanks to God for having added so many children to the Catholic Church; the splendid sight presented by the most noble island of Britain in

the restored honor paid with such wonderful pomp within its confines to the Blessed Eucharist, in the presence of a dense multitude and with a crown formed of our Venerable Brothers and of our own Legate, and in France, where the afflicted Church dried her tears to see such brilliant triumphs of the august Sacrament, especially in the town of Lourdes, the fiftieth anniversary of whose origin we have also been rejoiced to witness commemorated with such solemnity. In these and other facts all must see, and let the enemies of the Catholicism be persuaded of it, that the splendor of ceremonial and the devotion paid to the august Mother of God, and even the filial homage offered to the Supreme Pontiff, are all destined finally for the glory of God, that Christ may be all and in all (Coloss. iii., 11), that the kingdom of God may be established on earth and eternal salvation gained for men.

This triumph of God on earth, both in individuals and in society, is but the return of the erring to God through Christ, and to Christ through the Church, which we announced as the programme of our Pontificate both in our first apostolic letters, "*E supremi Apostolatus Cathedra*" (Encyclica die 4 Octobris MDCCCIII.), and many times since then. To this return we look with confidence, and our plans and hopes are all designed to lead to it as to a port in which the storms even of the present life are at rest. And this is why we are grateful for the homage paid to the Church in our humble person as being, with God's help, a sign of the return of the nations to Christ and a closer union with Peter and the Church.

This affectionate union, varying in intensity according to time and place, and differing in its mode of expression, seems in the designs of Providence to grow stronger as the times grow more difficult for the cause of sound teaching, of sacred discipline, of the liberty of the Church. We have examples of this in the saints of other centuries, whom God raised up to resist by their virtue and wisdom the fury of persecution against the Church and the diffusion of iniquity in the world. One of these we wish especially in these letters to commemorate, now that the eighth centenary of his death is being solemnly celebrated. We mean the Doctor Anselm of Aosta, most vigorous exponent of Catholic truth and defender of the rights of the Church, first as monk and abbot in France, and later as Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate in England. It is not inappropriate, we think, after the jubilee feasts, celebrated with unwonted splendor, of two other Doctors of Holy Church, Gregory the Great and John Chrysostom, one the light of the Western, the other of the Eastern Church, to fix our gaze on this other star which if it "differs in brightness" (I. Cor. xv., 41) from them, yet compares well with them in their course, and sheds abroad a light of doctrine and exam-

ple not less salutary than theirs. Nay, in some respects it might be said even more salutary, inasmuch as Anselm is nearer to us in time, place, temperament, studies, and there is a closer similarity with our own days in the nature of the conflicts borne by him, in the kind of pastoral activity he displayed, in the method of teaching applied and largely promoted by him, by his disciples, by his writings, all composed "in defense of the Christian religion, for the benefit of souls, and for the guidance of all theologians who were to teach sacred letters according to the scholastic method." (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis.) Thus as in the darkness of the night, while some stars are setting others rise to light the world, so the sons succeed to the fathers to illumine the Church, and among these St. Anselm shone forth as a most brilliant star.

In the eyes of the best of his contemporaries Anselm seemed to shine as a luminary of sanctity and learning amid the darkness of the error and iniquity of the age in which he lived. He was in truth a "prince of the faith, an ornament of the Church, . . . a glory of the episcopate, a man outranking all the great men of his time" (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi), "both learned and good and brilliant in speech, a man of splendid intellect" (In Epitaphio), whose reputation was such that it has been well written of him that there was no man in the world then "who would say: Anselm is less than I, or like me" (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi)—and hence esteemed by Kings, Princes and Supreme Pontiffs, as well as by his brethren in religion and by the faithful, nay, "beloved even by his enemies." (Epicedion in obitum Anselmi.) While he was still abbot the great and most powerful Pontiff Gregory VII. wrote him letters breathing esteem and affection and "recommending the Catholic Church and himself to his prayers" (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis); to him also wrote Urban II. recognizing "his distinction in religion and learning" (In libro II. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 32); in many and most affectionate letters Paschal II. extolled his "reverent devotion, strong faith, his pious and persevering zeal, his authority in religion and knowledge" (In lib. III. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 74 et 42), which easily induced the Pontiff to accede to his requests and made him not hesitate to call him the most learned and devout of the Bishops of England.

And yet Anselm in his own eyes was but a despicable and unknown good-for-nothing, a man of no parts, sinful in his life. Nor did this great modesty and most sincere humility detract in the least from his high thinking, whatever may be said to the contrary by men of depraved life and judgment, of whom the Scripture says that "the animal man understandeth not the things of the spirit of God." (I. Cor. ii., 14.) And more wonderful still, greatness of soul and

unconquerable constancy, tried in so many ways by troubles, attacks, exiles, were in him blended with such gentle and pleasing manners that he was able to calm the angry passions of his enemies and win the hearts of those who were enraged against him, so that the very men "to whom his cause was hostile" praised him because he was good. (*Epicedion in obitum Anselmi.*)

Thus in him there existed a wonderful harmony between qualities which the world falsely judges to be irreconcilable and contradictory—simplicity and greatness, humility and magnanimity, strength and gentleness, knowledge and piety, so that both in the beginning and throughout the whole course of his religious life "he was singularly esteemed by all as a model of sanctity and doctrine." (*Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis.*)

Nor was this double merit of Anselm confined within the walls of his own household or within the limits of the school—it went forth thence as from a military tent into the dust and the glare of the highway. For, as we have already hinted, Anselm fell on difficult days and had to undertake fierce battles in defense of justice and truth. Naturally inclined though he was to a life of contemplation and study, he was obliged to plunge into the most varied and important occupations, even those affecting the government of the Church, and thus to be drawn into the worst turmoils of his agitated age. With his sweet and most gentle temperament he was forced, out of love for sound doctrine and for the sanctity of the Church, to give up a life of peace, the friendship of the great ones of the world, the favors of the powerful, the united affection, which he at first enjoyed, of his very brethren in religion and in the episcopate, to live in daily trials, in troubles of all kinds. Thus, finding England full of hatred and dangers, he was forced to oppose a vigorous resistance to Kings and Princes, usurpers and tyrants over the Church and the people, against weak or unworthy ministers of the sacred office, against the ignorance and vice of the great and small alike; ever a valiant defender of the faith and morals, of the discipline and liberty, and therefore also of the sanctity and doctrine, of the Church of God, and thus truly worthy of that further encomium of Paschal: "Thanks be to God that in you the authority of the Bishop ever prevails, and that, although set in the midst of barbarians, you are not deterred from announcing the truth either by the violence of tyrants or the favor of the powerful, neither by the flame of fire or the force of arms; and again: "We rejoice because by the grace of God you are neither disturbed by threats nor moved by promises." (*In lib. III. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 44 e 74.*)

In view of all this, it is only right, Venerable Brothers, that we, after a lapse of eight centuries, should rejoice like our predecessor,

Paschal, and echoing his words return thanks to God. But at the same time it is a pleasure for us to be able to exhort you to fix your eyes on this luminary of doctrine and sanctity who, rising here in Italy, shone for over thirty years upon France, for more than fifteen years upon England, and finally upon the whole Church, as a tower of strength and beauty.

And if Anselm was great *in works and in words*, if in his knowledge and his life, in contemplation and activity, in peace and strife, he secured splendid triumphs for the Church and great benefits for society, all this must be ascribed to his close union with Christ and the Church throughout the whole course of his life and ministry.

Recalling all these things, Venerable Brothers, with special interest during the solmen commemoration of the great Doctor, we shall find in them splendid examples for our admiration and imitation; nay, reflection on them will also furnish us with strength and consolation amid the pressing cares of the government of the Church and of the salvation of souls, helping us never to fail in our duty of coöperating with all our strength in order that all things may be restored in Christ, that "Christ may be formed in all souls" (Galat. iv., 19), and especially in those which are the hope of the priesthood, of maintaining unswervingly the doctrine of the Church, of defending strenuously the liberty of the Spouse of Christ, the inviolability of her divine rights and the plenitude of those safeguards which the protection of the Sacred Pontificate requires.

For you are aware, Venerable Brothers, and you have often lamented it with us, how evil are the days on which we have fallen, and how iniquitous the conditions that have been forced upon us. Even in the unspeakable sorrow we felt in the recent public disasters, our wounds were opened afresh by the shameful charges invented against the clergy of being behindhand in rendering assistance after the calamity, by the obstacles raised to hide the beneficent action of the Church on behalf of the afflicted, by the contempt shown even for her maternal care and forethought. We say nothing of many other things injurious to the Church, devised with treacherous cunning or flagrantly perpetrated in violation of all public right and in contempt of all natural equity and justice. Most grievous, too, is the thought that this has been done in countries in which the stream of civilization has been most abundantly fed by the Church. For what more unnatural sight could be witnessed than that of some of those children whom the Church has nourished and cherished as her first-born, her flower and her strength, in their rage turning their weapons against the very bosom of the Mother that has loved them so much? And there are other countries which give us but little cause for consolation, in which the same war, under a different

form, has either broken out already or is being prepared by dark machinations. For there is a movement in those nations which have benefited most from Christian civilization to deprive the Church of her rights, to treat her as though she were not by nature and by right the perfect society that she is, instituted by Christ Himself, the Redeemer of our nature, and to destroy her reign, which, although primarily and directly affecting souls, is not less helpful for their eternal salvation than for the welfare of human society; efforts of all kinds are being made to supplant the kingdom of God by a reign of license under the lying name of liberty. And to bring about by the rule of vices and lusts the triumph of the worst of all slaveries and bring the people headlong to their ruin—"for sin makes peoples wretched (Prov. xiv., 34)—the cry is ever raised: "We will not have this man reign over us." Thus the religious orders, always the strong shield and the ornament of the Church and the promoters of the most salutary works of science and civilization among uncivilized and civilized peoples, have been driven out of Catholic countries; thus the works of Christian beneficence have been weakened and circumscribed as far as possible, thus the ministers of religion have been despised and mocked, and, wherever that was possible, reduced to powerlessness and inertia; the paths to knowledge and to the teaching office have been either closed to them or rendered extremely difficult, especially by gradually removing them from the instruction and education of youth; Catholic undertakings of public utility have been thwarted; distinguished laymen who openly profess their Catholic faith have been turned into ridicule, persecuted, kept in the background as belonging to an inferior and outcast class, until the coming of the day, which is being hastened by ever more iniquitous laws, when they are to be utterly ostracized from public affairs. And the authors of this war, cunning and pitiless as it is, boast that they are waging it through love of liberty, civilization and progress, and, were you to believe them, through a spirit of patriotism—in this lie, too, resembling their father, who "was a murderer from the beginning," and "when he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar" (Igan., viii., 44), and raging with hate insatiable against God and the human race. Brazen-faced men these, seeking to create confusion by their words and to lay snares for the ears of the simple. No, it is not patriotism, or zealous care for the people, or any other noble aim, or desire to promote good of any kind, that incites them to this bitter war, but blind hatred which feeds their mad plan to weaken the Church and exclude her from social life, which makes them proclaim her as dead, while they never cease to attack her—nay, after having despoiled her of all liberty, they do not hesitate in their brazen folly to taunt her with her powerlessness

to do anything for the benefit of mankind or human government. From the same hate spring the cunning misrepresentations or the utter silence concerning the most manifest services of the Church and the Apostolic See, when they do not make of our services a cause of suspicion, which with wily art they insinuate into the ears and the minds of the masses, spying and travestyng everything said or done by the Church as though it concealed some impending danger for society, whereas the plain truth is that it is mainly from Christ through the Church that the progress of real liberty and the purest civilization has been derived.

Concerning this war from outside, waged by the enemy without, "by which the Church is seen to be assailed on all sides, now in serried and open battle, now by cunning and by wily plots," we have frequently warned your vigilance, Venerable Brothers, and especially in the allocution we delivered in the Consistory of December 16, 1907.

But with no less severity and sorrow have we been obliged to denounce and to put down another species of war, intestine and domestic, and all the more disastrous the more hidden it is. Waged by unnatural children, nestling in the very bosom of the Church in order to rend it in silence, this war aims more directly at the very root and the soul of the Church. They are trying to corrupt the springs of Christian life and teaching, to scatter the sacred deposit of the faith, to overthrow the foundations of the divine constitution by their contempt for all authority, pontifical as well as episcopal, to put a new form on the Church, new laws, new principles, according to the tenets of monstrous systems; in short, to deface all the beauty of the Spouse of Christ for the empty glamor of a new culture, falsely called science, against which the Apostle frequently puts us on our guard: "Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the traditions of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ." (Colos. ii., 8.)

By this figment of false philosophy and this shallow and fallacious erudition, joined with a most audacious system of criticism, some have been seduced and "become vain in their thoughts" (Rom. i., 21), "having rejected good conscience, they have made shipwreck concerning the faith" (I. Tim. i., 19); they are being tossed about miserably on the waves of doubt, knowing not themselves at what port they must land; others, wasting both time and study, lose themselves in the investigation of abstruse trifling, and thus grow estranged from the study of divine things and of the real springs of doctrine. This hotbed of error and perdition (which has come to be known commonly as *modernism* from its craving for unhealthy novelty), although denounced several times and unmasked by the

very excesses of its adepts, continues to be a most grave and deep evil. It lurks like poison in the vitals of modern society, estranged as this is from God and His Church, and it is especially eating its way like a cancer among the young generations, which are naturally the most inexperienced and heedless. It is not the result of solid study and true knowledge, for there can be no real conflict between reason and faith. (Concil. Vatic., Constit. Dei filius, capo 4.) But it is the result of intellectual pride and of the pestiferous atmosphere that prevails of ignorance or confused knowledge of the things of religion, united with the stupid presumption of speaking about and discussing them. And this deadly infection is further fomented by a spirit of incredulity and of rebellion against God, so that those who are seized by the blind frenzy for novelty consider that they are all sufficient for themselves, and that they are at liberty to throw off either openly or by subterfuge the entire yoke of divine authority, fashioning for themselves according to their own caprice a vague, naturalistic *individual* religiosity, borrowing the name and some semblance of Christianity, but with none of its life and truth.

Now in all this it is not difficult to recognize one of the many forms of the eternal war waged against divine truth, and one that is all the more dangerous from the fact that its weapons are craftily concealed with a covering of fictitious piety, ingenuous candor and earnestness, in the hands of factious men who use them to reconcile things that are absolutely irreconcilable, viz., the extravagances of a fickle human science with divine faith, and the spirit of a frivolous world with the dignity and constancy of the Church.

But if you see all this, Venerable Brothers, and deplore it bitterly with us, you are not therefore cast down or without all hope. You know of the great conflicts that other times have brought upon the Christian people, very different though they were from our own days. We have but to turn again to the age in which Anselm lived, so full of difficulties as it appears in the annals of the Church. Then, indeed, was it necessary to fight for the altar and the home, for the sanctity of public law, for liberty, civilization, sound doctrine, of all of which the Church alone was the teacher and the defender among the nations, to curb the violence of Princes who arrogated to themselves the right of treading upon the most sacred liberties, to eradicate the vices, ignorance and uncouthness of the people, not yet entirely stripped of their old barbarism and often enough refractory to the educating influence of the Church, to rouse a part of the clergy who had grown lax or lawless in their conduct, inasmuch as not unfrequently they were selected arbitrarily and according to a perverse system of election by the Princes, and controlled by and bound to these in all things.

Such was the state of things notably in those countries on whose behalf Anselm especially labored, either by his teaching as master, by his example as religious or by his assiduous vigilance and many-sided activity as Archbishop and Primate. For his great services were especially accomplished for the provinces of Gaul, which a few centuries before had fallen into the hands of the Normans, and by the islands of Britain, which only a few centuries before had come to the Church. In both countries the convulsions caused by revolutions within and wars without gave rise to looseness of discipline both among the rulers and their subjects, among the clergy and the people.

Abuses like these were bitterly lamented by the great men of the time, such as Lanfranc, Anselm's master and later his predecessor in the See of Canterbury, and still more by the Roman Pontiffs, among whom it will suffice to mention here the courageous Gregory VII., the intrepid champion of justice, unswerving defender of the rights of the Church, vigilant guardian and defender of the sanctity of the clergy.

Strong in their example and rivalling them in their zeal, Anselm also lamented the same evils, writing thus to a prince of his people and one who rejoiced to describe himself as his relation by blood and affection: "You see, my dearest Lord, how the Church of God, our Mother, whom God calls His Fair One and His Beloved Spouse, is trodden underfoot by bad princes, how she is placed in tribulation for their eternal damnation by those to whom she was recommended by God as to protectors who would defend her, with what presumption they have usurped for their own uses the things that belong to her, the cruelty with which they despise and violate her religion and her law. Disdaining obedience to the decrees of the Apostolic See, made for the defense of religion, they surely convict themselves of disobedience to the Apostle Peter, whose place he holds, nay, to Christ, who recommended His Church to Peter. . . . Because they who refuse to be subject to the law of God are surely reputed the enemies of God." (Epist., libro III., epist. 65.) Thus wrote Anselm, and would that his words had been treasured by the successor and the descendants of that most potent prince and by the other sovereigns and peoples who were so loved and counselled and served by him.

But persecution, exile, spoliation, the trials and toils of hard fighting, far from shaking, only rooted deeper Anselm's love for the Church and the Apostolic See. "I fear no exile, or poverty, or torments, or death, because while God strengthens me, for all these things my heart is prepared for the sake of the obedience due to the Apostolic See and the liberty of the Church of Christ, my Mother" (Epist., libro III., ep. 73), he wrote to our predecessor, Paschal,

amid his greatest difficulties. And if he has recourse to the Chair of Peter for protection and help, the sole reason is: "lest through me and on account of me the constancy of ecclesiastical devotion and apostolic authority should ever be in the least degree weakened." And then he gives his reason, which for us is the badge of pastoral dignity and strength: "I would rather die, and while I live I would rather undergo utter penury in exile, rather than see the honor of the Church of God dimmed in the slightest degree on my account or through my example." (Epist., libro IV., ep. 47.)

That same honor, liberty and purity of the Church is ever in his mind; he yearns for it with sighs, prayers, sacrifices; he works for it with all his might both in vigorous resistance and in manly patience, and he defends it by his acts, his writings, his words. He recommends it in language strong and sweet to the brethren in religion, to the Bishops, the clergy and to all his faithful; but with more of severity to those princes who outraged it, to the great injury of themselves and their subjects.

These noble appeals for sacred liberty have a timely echo in our days on the lips of those "whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God" (Act. xx., 28)—timely even though they were to find no hearing by reason of the decay of faith or the perversity of men or the blindness of prejudice. To us, as you know well, Venerable Brothers, are especially addressed the words of the Lord: "Cry out, give yourself no rest, raise your voice like a trumpet" (Isai. lviii., 1), and all the more that "the Most High has made His voice heard" (Psalms xvii., 14), in the trembling nature and in tremendous calamities, "the voice of the Lord shaking the earth," ringing in our ears a terrible warning and bringing home to us the hard lesson that all but the eternal is vanity, that "we have not here a lasting city, but we seek one that is to come" (Hebr. xiii., 14), but also a voice not only of justice, but of mercy and of wholesome reminder to the erring nations. In the midst of these public calamities it behooves us to cry aloud and make known the great truths of the faith not only to the people, to the humble, the afflicted, but to the powerful and the rich, to them that decide and govern the policy of nations, to make known to all the great truths which history confirms by its great and disastrous lessons, such as that "sin makes the nations miserable" (Prov. xiv., 34), "that a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule" (Sap. vi., 7), with the admonition of Psalm ii.: "And now, ye Kings, understand; receive instruction, you that judge the earth. Serve the Lord with fear . . . embrace discipline lest at any time the Lord be angry, and you perish from the just way." More bitter shall be the consequences of these threats when the vices of society are being multiplied, when the sin of rulers

and of the people consists especially in the exclusion of God and in rebellion against the Church of Christ—that double social apostasy which is the deplorable fount of anarchy, corruption and endless misery for the individual and for society.

And since silence or indolence on our part, as unfortunately is not unfrequently the case among the good, would incriminate us, too, let every one of the sacred pastors take as said to himself for the defense of his flock, and bring home to others in due season, Anselm's words to the mighty Prince of Flanders: "As you are my Lord and truly beloved by me in God, I pray, conjure, admonish and counsel you, as the guardian of your soul, not to believe that your lofty dignity is diminished if you love and defend the liberty of the Spouse of God and your Mother, the Church, not to think that you abase yourself when you exalt her, not to believe that you weaken yourself when you strengthen her. Look round you and see; the examples are before you; consider the princes that attack and maltreat her. What do they gain by it, what do they attain? It is so clear that there is no need to say it." (Epist., lib. IV., ep. 12.) And all this he explains with his usual force and gentleness to the powerful Baldwin, King of Jerusalem: "As your most faithful friend, I pray, admonish and conjure you, and I pray God that you live under God's law and in all things submit your will to the will of God. For it is only when you reign according to the will of God that you reign for your own welfare. Nor permit yourself to believe, like so many bad Kings, that the Church of God has been given to you that you may use her as a servant, but remember that she has been recommended to you as to an advocate and defender. *In this world God loves nothing more than the liberty of His Church.* They who seek not so much to serve as to rule her are clearly acting in opposition to God. God wills His Spouse to be free and not a slave. Those who treat her and honor her as sons surely show that they are her sons and the sons of God, while those who lord it over her, as over a subject, make themselves not children, but strangers to her, and are therefore excluded from the heritage and the dower promised to her." (Epist., lib. IV., ep. 8.) Thus did he unbosom his heart so full of love for the Church; thus did he show his zeal in defense of her liberty, so necessary in the government of the Christian family and so dear to God, as the same great Doctor concisely affirmed in the energetic words: "*In this world God loves nothing more than the liberty of His Church.*" Nor can we, Venerable Brothers, make known to your our feelings better than by repeating that beautiful expression.

Equally opportune are other admonitions addressed by the saint to the powerful. Thus, for example, he wrote to Queen Matilda of

England: "If you wish in very deed to return thanks rightly and well and efficaciously to God, take into your consideration that Queen whom He was pleased to select for His spouse in this world. . . . Take her, I say, into your consideration, exalt her, that with her and in her you may be able to please God and reign with her in eternal bliss." (Epist., lib. III., ep. 57.) And especially when you chance to meet with some son who puffed up with earthly greatness lives unmindful of his mother, or hostile or rebellious to her, then remember that "it is for you to suggest frequently, in season and out of season, these and other admonitions, and to suggest that he show himself not the master, but the advocate, not the stepson, but the real son of the Church." (Epist., lib. III., ep. 59.) It behooves us, too, us especially, to inculcate that other saying so noble and so paternal of Anselm: "Whenever I hear anything of you displeasing to God and unbecoming to yourselves and fail to admonish you, I do not fear God nor love you as I ought." (Epist., lib. IV., ep. 52.) And especially when it comes to our ears that you treat the churches in your power in a manner unworthy of them and of your own soul, then we should imitate Anselm by renewing our prayers, counsels, admonitions, "that you think over these things carefully, and if your conscience warns you that there is something to be corrected in them, that you hasten to make the correction." (Epist., lib. IV., ep. 32.) "For nothing is to be neglected that can be corrected, since God demands an account from all not only of the evil they do, but also of the correction of evil which they can correct. And the more power men have to make the necessary correction the more rigorously does He require them, according to the power mercifully communicated to them, to think and act rightly. . . . And if you cannot do everything all at once, you must not on that account cease your efforts to advance from better to better, because God in His goodness is wont to bring to perfection good intentions and good effort, and to reward them with blessed plenitude." (Epist., lib. III., ep. 142.)

These and similar admonitions, most wise and holy, given by Anselm even to the lords and Kings of the world, may well be repeated by the pastors and Princes of the Church, as the natural defenders of truth, justice and religion in the world. In our times, indeed, the obstacles in the way of doing this have been enormously increased, so that there is, in truth, hardly room to stand without difficulty and danger. For while unbridled license reigns supreme the Church is obstinately fettered, the very name of liberty is mocked, and new devices are constantly being invented to thwart the work of yourselves and your clergy, so that it is no wonder that "you are not able to do everything all at once" for the correction of the

erring, the suppression of abuses, the promotion of right ideas and right living and the mitigation of the evils which weigh on the Church.

But there is comfort for us; the Lord liveth and "He will make all things work together unto good to them that love God." (Rom. viii., 28.) Even from these evils He will bring good, and above all the obstacles devised by human perversity He will make more splendid the triumph of His work and of His Church. Such is the wonderful design of the Divine Wisdom and such "His unsearchable ways" (Rom., xi., 33) in the present order of Providence, "for my thoughts are not your thoughts, nor my ways your ways, saith the Lord" (Isai. lv., 8), that the Church of Christ is destined ever to renew in herself the life of her Divine Founder, who suffered so much, and in a manner to "fill up what is wanting of the sufferings of Christ." (Coloss. i., 24.) Hence her condition as militant on earth divinely constrains her to live in the midst of contentions, troubles and difficulties, that thus "through many tribulations she may enter into the kingdom of God" (Act. xiv., 21) and at last be united with the Church triumphant in heaven.

Anselm's commentary on the passage of St. Matthew, "Jesus constrained His disciples to enter the boat," is directly to the point: "The words in their mystical sense summarize the state of the Church from the coming of Jesus Christ to the end of the world. *The ship, then, was buffeted by the waves in the midst of the sea,* while Jesus remained on the summit of the mountain; for ever since the Saviour ascended to heaven, holy Church has been agitated by great tribulations in the world, buffeted by various storms of persecution, harassed by the divers perversities of the wicked, and in many ways assailed by vice. *Because the wind was contrary,* because the influence of malign spirits is constantly opposed to her to prevent her from reaching the port of salvation, striving to submerge her under the opposing waves of the world, stirring up against her all possible difficulties." (Hom. iii.)

They err greatly, therefore, who lose faith during the storm, wishing for themselves and the Church a permanent state of perfect tranquillity, universal prosperity and practical, unanimous and uncontrasted recognition of her sacred authority. But the error is worse when men deceive themselves with the idea of gaining an ephemeral peace by cloaking the rights and interests of the Church, by sacrificing them to private interests, by minimizing them unjustly, by truckling to the world, "the whole of which is seated in wickedness" (I. Ioan. v., 19), on the pretext of reconciling the followers of novelties and bringing them back to the Church, as though any composition were possible between light and darkness, between Christ

and Belial. This hallucination is as old as the world, but it is always modern and always present in the world so long as there are soldiers who are timid or treacherous and at the first onset ready to throw down their arms or open negotiations with the enemy, who is the irreconcilable enemy of God and man.

It is for you, therefore, Venerable Brothers, whom Divine Providence has constituted to be the pastors and leaders of the Christian people, to resist with all your strength this most fatal tendency of modern society to lull itself in a shameful indolence while war is being waged against religion, seeking a cowardly neutrality made up of weak schemes and compromises to the injury of divine and human rights, to the oblivion of Christ's clear sentence: "He that is not with Me is against Me." (I. Cor. ix., 22.) Not, indeed, that it is not well at times to waive our rights as far it may lawfully be done and as the good of souls requires. And certainly this defect can never be charged to you who are spurred on by the charity of Christ. But this is only a reasonable condescension, which can be made without the slightest detriment to duty and which does not at all affect the eternal principles of truth and justice.

Thus we read how it was verified in the cause of Anselm, or rather in the cause of God and the Church, for which Anselm had to undergo such long and bitter conflicts. And when he had settled at last the long contest, our predecessor, Paschal II., wrote to him: "We believe that it has been through your charity and through your persistent prayers that the Divine mercy has been persuaded to turn to the people entrusted to your care." And referring to the paternal indulgence shown by the Supreme Pontiff to the guilty, he adds: "As regards the great indulgence we have shown, know that it is the fruit of our great affection and compassion in order that we might be able to lift up those who were down. For if the one standing erect merely holds out his hand to a fallen man, he will never lift him, unless he, too, bends down a little. Besides, although this act of stooping may seem like the act of falling, it never goes so far as to lose the equilibrium of rectitude." (In libro III. Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 140.)

In making our own these words of our most pious predecessor, written for the consolation of Anselm, we would not hide our very keen sense of the danger which confronts the very best among the pastors of the Church of passing the just limit either of indulgence or resistance. How they have realized this danger is easily to be seen in the anxieties, trepidations and tears of most holy men who have had borne in upon them the terrible responsibility of the government of souls and the greatness of the danger to which they are exposed, but it is to be seen most strikingly in the life of Anselm.

When he was torn from the solitude of the studious life of the cloister, to be raised to a lofty dignity in most difficult times, he found himself a prey to the most tormenting solicitude and anxiety, and chief of all the fear that he might not do enough for the salvation of his own soul and the souls of his people, for the honor of God and of His Church. But amid all these anxieties and in the grief he felt at seeing himself abandoned culpably by many, even including his brethren in the episcopate, his one great comfort was his trust in God and in the Apostolic See. Threatened with shipwreck and while the storm raged round him, he took refuge in the bosom of the Church, his Mother, invoking from the Roman Pontiff pitiful and prompt aid and comfort. (Epistol., lib. III., ep. 37.) God, perhaps, permitted that this great man, full of wisdom and sanctity as he was, should suffer such heavy tribulation in order that he might be a comfort and an example to us in the greatest difficulties and trials of the pastoral ministry and that the sentence of Paul might be realized in each one of us: "Gladly will I glory in my infirmities that the power of Christ may dwell in me. For which cause I please myself in my infirmities . . . for when I am weak then am I powerful." (II. Cor. xii., 9, 10.) Such, indeed, are the sentiments which Anselm expressed to Urban II.: "Holy Father, I am grieved that I am not what I was, grieved to be a Bishop, because by reason of my sins I do not perform the office of a Bishop. While I was in a lowly position I seemed to be doing something; set in a lofty place, burdened by an immense weight, I gain no fruit for myself and am of no use to anybody. I give way beneath the burden because I am incredibly poor in the strength, virtue, zeal and knowledge necessary for so great an office. I would fain flee from the insupportable anxiety and leave the burden behind me, but on the other hand I fear to offend God. The fear of God obliged me to accept it; the same fear of God constrains me to retain the same burden. Now, since God's will is hidden from me and I know not what to do, I wander about in sighs, and know not how to put an end to it all." (Epist., lib. III., ep. 37.)

Thus does God bring home even to saintly men their natural weakness in order the better to make manifest in them the power of strength from above, and by a humble and real sense of their individual insufficiency to preserve with greater force their obedience to the authority of the Church. We see it in the case of Anselm and of other contemporaries of his who fought for the liberty and doctrine of the Church under the guidance of the Apostolic See. The fruit of their obedience was victory in the strife, and their example confirmed the Divine sentence that "the obedient man will sing victory." (Prov. xxi., 28.) The hope of the same reward shines out

for all those who obey Christ in His Vicar in all that concerns the guidance of souls, or the government of the Church, or that is in any way connected with these objects; since "upon the authority of the Holy See depend the directions and the counsels of the sons of the Church." (Epist., lib. IV., ep. 1.)

How Anselm excelled in this virtue, with what warmth and fidelity he ever maintained perfect union with the Apostolic See, may be seen in the words he wrote to Pope Paschal: "How earnestly my mind, according to the measure of its power, clings in reverence and obedience to the Apostolic See is proved by the many and most painful tribulations of my heart, which are known only to God and myself. . . . From this union I hope in God that there is nothing which could ever separate me. Therefore do I desire, as far as this is possible, to put all my acts at the disposition of this same authority in order that it may direct and when necessary correct them." (Epist., lib. IV., ep. 5.)

The same strong constancy is shown in all his actions and writings, and especially in his letters, which our predecessor, Paschal, describes as "written with the pen of charity." (In lib. III., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 74.) But in his letters to the Pontiff he does not content himself with imploring *pitiful aid and comfort*; he also promises assiduous prayers, in most tender words of filial affection and unswerving faith, as when, while still Abbot of Bec, he wrote to Urban II.: "For your tribulation and that of the Roman Church, which is our tribulation and that of all the true faithful, we never cease praying God assiduously to mitigate your evil days, till the pit be dug for the sinner. And although He seems to delay, we are certain that the Lord will not leave the sceptre of sinners over the heritage of the just, that He will never abandon His heritage, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." (In libro II., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 33.)

In this and other similar letters of Anselm we find wonderful comfort not only in the renewal of the memory of a saint so devoted to the Apostolic See, but because they serve to recall your own letters and your other innumerable proofs of devotion, Venerable Brothers, in similar conflicts and similar sorrows.

Certainly it is a wonderful thing that the union of the Bishops and the faithful with the Roman Pontiff has drawn ever more and more close amid the hurtling of the storms that have been let loose on Christianity through the ages, and in our own times it has become so unanimous and so warm that its divine character is more apparent than ever before. It is indeed our greatest consolation, as it is the glory and the invincible bulwark of the Church. But its very force makes it all the more an object of envy to the demon and of hatred

to the world, which knows nothing similar to it in earthly societies, and finds no explanation of it in political and human reasonings, seeing that it is the fulfillment of Christ's sublime prayer at the Last Supper.

But, Venerable Brothers, it behooves us to strive by all means to preserve this divine union and render it ever more intimate and cordial, fixing our gaze not on human considerations, but on those that are divine, in order that we may be all *one thing alone* in Christ. By developing this noble effort we shall fulfill ever better our sublime mission, which is that of continuing and propagating the work of Christ and of His kingdom on earth. This, indeed, is why the Church throughout the ages continues to repeat the loving prayer, which is also the warmest aspiration of our heart: "Holy Father, keep them in Thy name whom Thou hast given me, that they may be one, as We also are." (Ioan. xvii., 11.)

This effort is necessary not only to oppose the assaults from without of those who fight openly against the liberty and the rights of the Church, but also in order to meet the dangers from within, arising from that second kind of war which we deplored above when we made mention of those misguided persons who are trying by their cunning systems to overthrow from the foundations the very constitution and essence of the Church, to stain the purity of her doctrine and destroy her entire discipline. For even still there continues to circulate that poison which has been inoculated into many even among the clergy, and especially the young clergy, who have, as we have said, become infected by the pestilential atmosphere in their unbridled craving for novelty which is drawing them to the abyss and drowning them.

Then, again, by a deplorable aberration the very progress, good in itself, of positive science and material prosperity gives occasion and pretext for a display of intolerable arrogance towards divinely revealed truth on the part of many weak and intemperate minds. But these should rather remember the many mistakes and the frequent contradictions made by the followers of rash novelties in those questions of a speculative and practical order most vital for man, and realize that human pride is punished by never being able to be coherent with itself and by suffering shipwreck without ever sighting the port of truth. They are not able to profit by their own experience to humble themselves and "to destroy the counsels and every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bring into captivity every understanding even unto the obedience of Christ." (II. Cor. x., 4, 5.)

Nay, their very arrogance has led them into the other extreme, and their philosophy, throwing doubt on everything in darkness,

has involved them; hence the present profession of agnosticism with other absurd doctrines springing from an infinite series of systems in discord with one another and with right reason; so that "they have become vain in their thoughts . . . for professing themselves to be wise they became fools." (Rom. i., 21, 22.)

But unfortunately their grandiloquent phrases and their promises of a new wisdom, fallen as it were from heaven, and of new methods of thought, have found favor with many young men, as those of the Manicheans found favor with Augustine, and have returned these aside, more or less unconsciously, from the right road. But concerning such pernicious masters of an insane knowledge, of their aims, their illusions, their erroneous and disastrous system, we have spoken at great length in our encyclical letter of September 8, 1907, "*Pascendi dominici gregis.*"

Here it is well to note that if the dangers we have mentioned are more serious and more imminent in our own days, they are not altogether different from those that threatened the doctrine of the Church in the time of St. Anselm, and that we may find in his labors as Doctor almost the same help and comfort for the safeguarding of the truth as we found in his apostolic firmness for the defense of the liberty and rights of the Church.

Without entering here in detail into the intellectual state of the clergy and people in that distant age, there was a notable danger in a twofold excess to which the intellects of the time were prone.

There was at the time a class of light-minded and vain men, fed on a superficial erudition, who became incredibly puffed up with their undigested culture and allowed themselves to be led away by a simulacrum of philosophy and dialectics. In their inane fallacy, which they called by the name of science, "they despised the sacred authority, dared with impious temerity to dispute one or other of the dogmas professed by Catholic faith . . . and in their foolish pride considered anything they could not understand as impossible, instead of confessing with humble wisdom that there might be many things beyond the reach of their comprehension. . . . For there are some who immediately they have begun to grow the horns of an overweening knowledge—not knowing that when a person thinks he knows something, he does not yet know in what manner he should know it—before they have grown spiritual wings through firmness in the faith, are wont to rise presumptuously to the highest questions of the faith. Thus it happens that while . . . against all right rules they endeavor to rise prematurely by their intelligence, their lack of intelligence brings them down to manifold errors." (S. Anselm., *De Fide Trinitatis*, capit. 2.) And of such as these we have many painful examples under our eyes!

Others again there were of a more timid nature, who in their terror at the many cases of those who had made shipwreck of the faith, and fearing the danger of the science that puffeth up, went so far as to exclude altogether the use of philosophy, if not of all rational discussion of the sacred doctrines.

Midway between these two excesses stands the Catholic practice, which, while it abhors the presumption of the first class, who "puffed up like bladders with the wind of vanity" (according to the phrase of Gregory XIV. in the succeeding age) "went beyond the true limits in their efforts to establish the faith by natural reason, adulterating the word of God with the figments of the philosopher" (Gregor. IX., Epist. "Tacti dolore cordis" ad theologos Parisien, 7 Jul., 1228), so, too, it condemns the negligence of the second class in their excessive neglect of true investigation and the absence of all desire in them "to draw profit from the faith for their intelligence" (In libro II., Epist. S. Anselmi, ep. 41), especially when their office requires of them to defend the Catholic faith against the errors that arise on all sides.

For this defense it may well be said that Anselm was raised up by God to point out by his example, his words and his writings the safe road, to unseal for the common good the springs of Christian wisdom and to be the guide and rule of those Catholic teachers who after him taught "the sacred letters by the method of the school" (Breviar. Rom., die 21 Aprilis), and who thus came rightly to be esteemed and celebrated as their precursor.

Not, indeed, that the Doctor of Aosta reached all at once the heights of theological and philosophical speculation or the reputation of the two supreme masters, Thomas and Bonaventure. The later fruits of the wisdom of these last did not ripen but with time and the collaboration of many doctors. Anselm himself, with that great modesty so characteristic of the truly wise, and with all his learning and perspicacity, never published any writings except such as were called forth by circumstances or when compelled thereto by some authority, and in those he did publish he protests that "if there is anything that calls for correction he does not refuse the correction" (Cur Deus homo, lib. II., cap. 23), nay, when the question is a debated one and not connected with the faith, he tells his disciple: "You must not so cling to what we have said as to abide by it obstinately, when others with more weighty arguments succeed in overthrowing ours and establishing opinions against them; should that happen, you will not deny at least that what we have said has been of profit for exercise in controversy." (De Grammatico, cap. 21 sub finem.)

Yet Anselm accomplished far more than he ever expected or than

others expected of him. He secured a position in which his merits were not dimmed by the glory of those that came after him, not even of the great Thomas, even when the latter declined to accept all his conclusions and treated more clearly and accurately questions already treated by him. To Anselm belongs the distinction of having opened the road to speculation, of removing the doubts of the timid, the dangers of the incautious and the injuries done by the quarrelsome and the sophistical, "the heretical dialecticians" of his time as he rightly calls them, in whom reason was the slave of the imagination and of vanity. (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.)

Against these latter he observes that "while all are to be warned to enter with the utmost circumspection upon questions affecting the Sacred Scriptures, these dialecticians of our time are to be completely debarred from the discussion of spiritual questions." And the reason he assigns for this is especially applicable now to those who imitate them under our eyes, repeating their old errors: "For in their souls, reason, which should be the king and the guide of all that is in man, is so mixed up with corporal imaginations that it is impossible to disentangle it from these, nor is itself able to distinguish from them the things that it alone and pure should contemplate." (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.) Appropriate, too, for our own times are those words of his in which he ridicules those false philosophers, "who because they are not able to understand what they believe dispute the truth of the faith itself, confirmed by the Holy Fathers, just as if bats and owls who see the heaven only by night were to dispute concerning the rays of the sun at noon, against eagles who gaze at the sun unblinkingly." (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.)

Hence, too, he condemns, here or elsewhere, the perverse opinion of those who conceded too much to philosophy by attributing to it the right to invade the domain of theology. In refuting this foolish theory he defines well the confines proper to each, and hints sufficiently clearly at the functions of reason in the things of divinely revealed doctrine. "Our faith," he says, "must be defended by reason against the impious." But how and how far? The question is answered in the words that follow: "It must be shown to them reasonably how unreasonable is their contempt of us." (*In ligro Epist. S. Anselmi*, ep. 41.) The chief office, therefore, of philosophy is to show us the reasonableness of our faith and the consequent obligation of believing the divine authority proposing to us the profoundest mysteries, which with all signs of credibility that testify to them, are supremely worthy of being believed. Far different is the proper function of Christian theology, which is based on the fact of divine revelation and renders more solid in the faith those who

already profess to enjoy the honor of the name of Christian. "Hence it is altogether clear that no Christian should dispute as to how that is not which the Catholic Church believes with the heart and confesses with the mouth, but even holding beyond all doubt the same faith, loving and living according to it, must seek as far as reason is able, how it is. If he is able to understand, let him return thanks, let him not prepare his horns for attack, but bow his head in reverence." (De Fide Trinitatis, cap. 2.)

When, therefore, theologians search and the faithful ask for reasons concerning our faith, it is not for the purpose of founding on them their faith, which has for its foundation the authority of God revealing; yet, as Anselm puts it, "as right order requires that we believe the profundities of the faith before we presume to discuss them with our reason, so it seems to me to be negligence if after we have been confirmed in the faith we do not strive to understand what we believe." (Cur Deus homo, lib. 1, c. 2.) And here Anselm means that intelligence of which the Vatican Council speaks. (Constit. Dei filius, cap. 4.) For, as he shows elsewhere, "although since the time of the Apostles many of our Holy Fathers and Doctors say so many and such great things of the reason of our faith . . . yet they were not able to say all they might have said had they lived longer; and the reason of the truth is so ample and so deep that it can never be exhausted by mortals; and the Lord does not cease to impart the gifts of grace in His Church, with whom He promises to be until the consummation of the world. And to say nothing of the other texts in which the Sacred Scripture invites us to investigate reason, in the one in which it says that if you do not believe you will not understand, it plainly admonishes us to extend the intention to the intellect, while it teaches us how we are to advance towards it (*aperte nos monet intentionem ad intellectum extendere, cum docet qualiter ad illum debeamus proficere*). Nor is the last reason he alleges to be neglected: "in the midst between faith and vision is the intellectual knowledge which is within our reach in this life, and the more one can advance in this the nearer he approaches to the vision, for which we all yearn." (De Fide Trinitatis, Praefatio.)

With these and the like principles Anselm laid the foundations of the true principles of philosophical and theological studies which were other most learned men, the princes of scholasticism, and chief among them the Doctor of Aquinas, followed, developed, illustrated and perfected to the great honor and protection of the Church. If we have insisted so willingly on this distinction of Anselm, it is in order to have a new and much-desired occasion, Venerable Brothers, to inculcate upon you to see to it that you bring back youth, especially among the clergy, to the most wholesome springs of Chris-

tian wisdom, first opened by the Doctor of Aosta and abundantly enriched by Aquinas. On this head remember always the instructions of our predecessor, Leo XIII., of happy memory, and those we have ourselves given more than once, and again in the above-mentioned encyclical, "*Pascendi dominici gregis*." Bitter experience only too clearly proves every day the loss and the ruin ensuing from the neglect of these studies, or from the pursuit of them without a clear and sure method; while many, before being fitted or prepared, presumed to discuss the deepest questions of the faith. (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.) Deploring this evil with Anselm, we repeat the strong recommendations made by him: "Let no one rashly plunge into the intricate questions of divine things until he has first acquired, with firmness in the faith, gravity of conduct and of wisdom, lest while discussing with uncautious levity amid the manifold twistings of sophistry he fall into the toils of some tenacious error." (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.) And this same incautious levity, when heated, as so often is the case, at the fire of the passions proves the total ruin of serious studies and of the integrity of doctrine. Because, puffed up with that foolish pride, lamented by Anselm in the heretical dialecticians of his time, they despise the sacred authorities of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Fathers and Doctors, concerning which a more modest genius would be glad to use instead the respectful words of Anselm: "Neither in our own time nor in the future do we ever hope to seek their like in the contemplation of the truth." (*De Fide Trinitatis*, *Praefatio*.)

Nor do they hold in greater account the authority of the Church and of the Supreme Pontiff whenever efforts are made to bring them to a better sense, although at times as far as words go they are lavish of promises of submission as long as they can hope to hide themselves behind these and gain credit and protection. This contempt almost bars the way to all well-founded hope of the conversion of the erring; while they refuse obedience to him "to whom Divine Providence as to the Lord and Father of the whole Church in its pilgrimage on earth . . . has entrusted the custody of Christian life and faith and the government of His Church; wherefore when anything arises in the Church against the Catholic faith to no other authority but his is to be rightly referred for correction and to no other with such certainty as to him has it been shown what answer is to be made to error in order that it may be examined by his prudence." (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.) And would to God that these poor wanderers, on whose lips one so often hears the fair words of sincerity, conscience, religious experience, the faith that is felt and lived, and so on, learned their lesson from Anselm, understood his holy teachings, imitated his glorious example, and above all

took deeply to heart those words of his: "First the heart is to be purified by faith, and first the eyes are to be illuminated by the observance of the precepts of the Lord . . . and first with humble obedience to the testimonies of God we must become small to learn wisdom . . . and not only when faith and obedience to the commandments are removed is the mind hindered from ascending to the intelligence of higher truths, but often enough the intelligence that has been given is taken away and faith is overthrown, when right conscience is neglected." (*De Fide Trinitatis*, cap. 2.)

But if the erring continue obstinately to scatter the seeds of dissension and error, to waste the patrimony of the sacred doctrine of the Church, to attack discipline, to heap contempt on venerated customs, "to destroy which is a species of heresy" (*S. Anselm., De nuptiis consanguineorum*, cap. 1), in the phrase of St. Anselm, and to destroy the constitution of the Church in its very foundations, then all the more strictly must we watch, Venerable Brothers, and keep away from our flock, and especially from youth, which is the most tender part of it, so deadly a pest. This grace we implore of God with incessant prayers, interposing the most powerful patronage of the August Mother of God and the intercession of the blessed citizens of the Church triumphant, St. Anselm especially, shining light of Christian wisdom, incorrupt guardian and valiant defender of all the sacred rights of the Church, to whom we would here, in conclusion, address the same words that our holy predecessor, Gregory VII., wrote to him during his lifetime: "Since the sweet odor of your good works has reached us, we return due thanks for them to God, and we embrace you heartily in the love of Christ, holding it for certain that by your example the Church of God has been greatly benefited, and that by your prayers and those of men like you she may even be liberated from the dangers that hang over her, with the mercy of Christ to succor us." Hence we beg your fraternity to implore God assiduously to relieve the Church and us who govern it, albeit unworthily, from the pressing assaults of the heretics and lead these from their errors to the way of truth." (*In libro II., Epist. S. Anselmi*, ep. 31.)

Supported by this great protection, and trusting in your coöperation, we bestow the Apostolic Benediction with all affection in the Lord, as a pledge of heavenly grace and in testimony of our goodwill, on all of you, Venerable Brothers, and on the clergy and people entrusted to each of you.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's on the feast of St. Anselm, April 21, 1909, in the eighth year of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

Book Reviews

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. Edited by Charles G. Herbermann, Ph. D., LL. D., Edward A. Pace, Ph. D., D. D., Thomas J. Shahan, D. D., Conde B. Pallen, Ph. D., LL. D., John J. Wynne, S. J., assisted by collaborators. In fifteen volumes. Vol. V.—Dioc-Fath., pp. 795. Illustrated and illuminated.

The "Catholic Encyclopedia" is progressing splendidly. Volume V. completes one-third of the work. The original high standard of excellence in every department is being preserved and raised a little higher with each succeeding volume. The original plan, excellent in every respect, is being followed out faithfully with the natural development suggested by practical experience. One of the greatest difficulties in a work of this kind is to fill the places of collaborators who are removed by death or by calls to other duties or by disability of any kind. The managers foresaw this difficulty, prepared for it and overcame it. They have studied the Catholic literary world so well that they seem to know every one in it and to be able to command his or her services at the proper moment. In the same connection it is worthy of remark that the field is exhaustless. This is one of the many things which the encyclopedia is teaching us. It is introducing us to the Catholic literary men of the world.

The editors have profited by fair criticism of their work. There has been very little adverse criticism. There is a large field for difference of opinion in a work of this kind, and much that has been said has been by way of suggestion. It is very difficult to decide that some one person is best fitted for a particular article to the exclusion of everybody else; it is also difficult to decide the relative amount of space to be devoted to the different articles; it is not easy at all times to settle the question of what subject shall have independent treatment. There may be difference of opinion as to all these things, and much of the criticism of the encyclopedia has been in this field. Keeping this in mind, an unbiased reader after looking over the whole field will probably be willing to concede that the book is scarcely capable of improvement in these regards.

Many new names appear in the present volume; many subjects of unusual interest are treated; but this is true of every volume, and is hardly worthy of special notice. Glancing over the book, "Education" strikes the eye, and holds it. "England" and "Egypt" rivet the attention. "Excommunication" and "Evolution" invite prompt reading, and many other subjects hardly less interesting confront us.

We are almost tempted to end with a bull and say that the "Catholic Encyclopedia" is as good as ever, and better.

SELECTED SERMONS. By *Rev. Christopher Hughes*, pastor of St. Mary's Church, Fall River, Mass. Introduction by *Walter Elliott*, C. S. P. 12mo., pp. 222. Fr. Pustet, New York.

Father Elliott is so good an authority on preaching, and he has reviewed this book so thoroughly in his introduction, that we prefer to let him speak to our readers about it:

"To aid Catholic pastors in performing rightly their high function of the ministry of the Word of God, Father Hughes has published this volume of sermons, and in our opinion he has done his work well. The test of excellence in a sermon no less than in a preacher is experiment. Himself a good preacher, the author published but a comparatively small number of sermons out of very many actually preached by him, some of them more than once. The clergy are here invited to examine these sermons, chosen from a multitude of others really preached to an average city congregation, and preached over again, and now offered after careful revision. The style, though not unrhctorical, is good, clear, forcible English, the sentences short, the matter cleared of all extraneous thought and the manner of all verbiage.

"The sermons are all of them brief, so that they may be readily committed to memory by beginners or serve as outlines for the more practiced, dealing each with one idea of strictly religious value, simply viewed, well illustrated, powerfully advocated and enforced. The tone is at once earnest and priestly, adapted to the altar and the pulpit. Holy Scripture is happily and abundantly quoted. The range of the subject does not expressly tally with the routine of the ecclesiastical year, though the topics chosen are such as to serve practically the same purpose. Some of the sermons are on the critical points of controversy of our times, touching the relation of the religious and the civil states of men, and the bearings of our civilization on the spiritual life. Others of them are such as are not to be found, as far as our knowledge goes, anywhere printed in Catholic publications of this sort, that is to say, those which give utterance to the voice of religion on patriotic occasions, such as Decoration Day, and others again arouse tender memories of the cradle-land of our Irish-American congregations.

"Education, viewed from a standpoint at once American and Catholic, is fully represented in the choice of subjects presented by the author. There is a fine sermon on 'Religious Indifferentism,' and an inspiring one on 'Intemperance,' preached at the opening of the convention of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union in 1876. Prayer, confession, the Eucharist, sanctifying grace and its effects are treated of with much power, the supernatural gifts of the Christian state being fully displayed. A beautiful sermon for Advent, entitled 'The King's Return,' a very moving and yet practical charity

sermon entitled 'Almsgiving,' one on the 'Uncanonized Saints of Ireland,' one preached at the funeral of priests and others on the Blessed Virgin, St. Joseph and St. Patrick—these have impressed us as of particular use for the great body of Catholic preachers. Finally, these sermons, so brief and so plain, and yet so full of instruction and so earnest in tone, are well adapted for the use of persons who are hindered from attending Sunday Mass, or who desire devotional reading for the sick."

LA RELIGION DES PRIMITIFS. Par Mgr. A. Le Roy Evêque d'Alinda, Supérieur Général des Peres du Saint-Esprit. Libraire Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, rue de Rennes, 117, Paris.

This volume of Mgr. Le Roy is the outcome of the course of lectures delivered by the author on "The History of Religions" at the Catholic Institute of Paris in 1907 and 1908. It is not only the best, but the only really and thoroughly good book published until the present moment on these questions. Its statements are supported throughout by well authenticated facts. Most other works written on these matters betray the preconceived ideas of their authors concerning the religious ignorance of the savages and their lack of moral standards. They show particularly the firm belief of their writers concerning the explanation of the origin of their religions, which they assert arise totally from the nature of man. Does not this smack strongly of modernism? The modernist of to-day claims the right to derive all his religion from the demands of his nature, and he imagines that the primitive savages from their origin have made the same claim. If this be true, the modernist and the savage may well claim fellowship with each other, and perhaps of both the savage may find himself to be the less flattered by the comparison.

Mgr. Le Roy spent twenty years in Africa. He brought with him all the ideas commonly entertained in Europe about the dark tribes—people addicted to fetichism, without religion, without morals, without family, besotted worshipers of animals, trees and stones. His missionary experiences soon proved to him the incorrectness of these ideas. He discovered real treasures of moral delicacy amidst strange aberrations—magnificent rites, self-accusation, for instance, by the confession of one's sins in order to be purified from the moral defilement of which they feel conscious. In one part of the volume a whole ceremonial of this confession and absolution is described in detail as it exists in Kikuyu, a district of British East Africa. The author assures us that in these twenty years of his apostolate in Africa not a day passed without adding to his fund of knowledge, correcting an idea, clearing up a doubt, changing an

hypothesis, furnishing an explanation, verifying a fact, abolishing a falsehood, unveiling a discovery. The principal sub-divisions of the work are: "The Primitive in Presence of Nature," "The Primitive and the Family," "Belief," "Morality," "Worship," "Magic," "The Religions of the Primitives Compared," "Christianity in Presence of Human Religions," "The Catholic Religion Coming in Contact with the Primitive Religion."

It is to be hoped that this excellent work will have a large circulation, not only in its original French garb, but also in the many other languages spoken by the missionaries of various nationality who belong to the religious society governed at present by Mgr. Le Roy. A considerable number of the Holy Ghost Fathers exercise their missionary zeal on the American continent. Very probably some amongst them will be found to devote himself to the very useful task of translating into English this deeply interesting and instructive work of the superior general of their society.

REGESTA PONTIFICUM ROMANORUM Jubente Regia Societate Gottingensi
 Congessit *Paulis Kehr*. Vol. I, pp. xxvi.+201. Pr., 6 marks. Vol. III,
 pp. iii.+482. Pr., 16 marks. Berolini apud Welmannos.

The Royal Society of Göttingen is certainly providing a most effective instrument of historical research by undertaking the publication of these "Regesta" of the Roman Pontiffs. Hitherto the student of history, ecclesiastical or profane, pertinent to the field thereby covered, if unable to consult the original documents, has had to depend upon Jaffé's well-known work on the same subject (Berlin, 1851)—a work which though meritorious and serviceable in its time, leaves much to be desired both as regards comprehensiveness of material and its mechanical make-up—deficiencies which have been in a measure, but by no means adequately made good in the more recent edition gotten out by Wattenbach (1885-88). In the work at hand the editor has endeavored to complete and perfect what Jaffé and the subsequent curators were not in a position to accomplish. The improvements lie in the first place in the insertion of a considerable number of documents which have only recently come to light through the opening out of the archives; and in the second place in the disposition of the material—the chronological order followed by Jaffé being abandoned for that of locality, thus greatly facilitating the task of searching for documents. These features are further perfected by the addition of various indexes and summaries, while the bibliographical references likewise extend the usefulness of the work in no small degree. Three volumes, the first and third of which appear in title above—the second has not reached the

present reviewer—have thus far been published. The scope of the entire undertaking embraces the *regesta* issued by the Holy See down to Innocent III. The first volume contains the concessions of privileges, the letters and other pontifical *acta* addressed to the various churches, monasteries and individual persons of Rome—the city—during that period—namely, from Pius I. to Celestine III., inclusive. The third volume comprises the corresponding documents addressed to the dioceses of Etruria, *i. e.*, Tuscany. The limits of mediæval Tuscany it is difficult to define. It seems to have embraced more than twenty different dioceses. The abundance of the Papal documents relating to the territory is so great that Dr. Kehr has been obliged to distribute them over several volumes. Those concerning nine of the dioceses have been given in the second volume (Latium); those referring to twelve other of the Tuscan dioceses appear in the third volume (Etruria); the remaining are reserved for the fourth volume. It should be noted that the work makes no appeal to the general reader. It interests exclusively the historical student, the one who knows the value of “facts and dates.” Such an one it furnishes with an immense amount of minute original material critically and scholarly edited and authenticated—a source of reference that should find a place in every historical library.

LEIBNIZ par *Jean Baruzi* avec de nombreux textes inédits. Paris: Bloud et Cie, 1909. Pp. 386. Pr., 3½ francs.

In view of the numerous editions of the collected works of Leibniz, published between Dutens' “Opera Leibnitii,” which appeared in Geneva so long ago as 1768, and “Die Philosophiechen Schriften,” edited by Gerhardt, which were completed so recently as 1890 (7 vols., Berlin, 1875-1890)—and M. Baruzi quotes at least four intervening editions—to say nothing of the countless republications of special works of the great philosopher, together with the immense literature appertaining to him—in view, I say, of all that has been given to the world, whether by or concerning Leibniz, during the past two and more centuries, it may seem somewhat surprising to be told that prior to 1900 Leibniz was not fully understood. Yet that is what the author of the book at hand affirms—“Leibniz en sa vie totale et en la multipli manifestation de sa pensée était ignoré encore en 1900” (p. 4)—and he rightly signalizes the fact as unique in the history of philosophy. The actual personalities of the other great thinkers—Kant, Descartes, Spinoza—have, it is true, been late to come to their true recognition. The process, however, in their case has been gradual, whereas in the case of Leibniz it

was comparatively sudden. The reason of this has been that Leibniz's correspondence, consisting of some fifteen thousand letters, is practically still unpublished; and it is but recently that serious efforts have been made even to arrange and catalogue the vast material, which has remained almost in its primitive class in the Hanoverian archives. Of those who have done most to make the real Leibniz known by a thorough study of the original data M. Baruzi must be given a prominent if not the first place. His preceding work on Leibniz in Alcan's well-known series ("*Les Grandes Philosophes*," Paris, 1907) is a monument of scholarship as solid as it is expressive.

His recent book—the one here presented—while much smaller, is more general and affords a fuller portrait of its subject than its predecessor, which deals mainly with one special aspect—the philosopher's ideas on the religious organization of the world. Rather, we should say that the present volume happily combines the general with the special. The introduction, which comprises more than a third of the book (pp. 1-135), presents quite an elaborate study of the philosopher's life and mind and work. The remainder of the volume is made up of extracts and fragments, some of them now published for the first time. The material thus gathered together serves to illustrate principally the religious side of the Leibnizian thought and character. This specialization falls in with the relation of the volume to the series to which it belongs, "*La Pensée Chrétienne*"—a series to which the REVIEW has previously alluded as a scholarly and timely apparatus at the service of the student and the enlightened reader. Like its predecessors in the collection, it happily combines the double effect of both instructing and interesting—rich in its matter, it is equally attractive in its form.

THE REVIVAL OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.
By *Joseph Louis Perrier, Ph. D.* New York: The Columbia University Press (Macmillan Company), 1909. Pp. viii.+344.

Some two years ago the literature of philosophy in English was enriched by a translation of Dr. De Wulf's, the eminent Louvain professor's "*Introduction à la Philosophie Néo-scholastique*" (Dublin, 1907). The translation was made by Dr. Coffey, of Maynooth, and the academic position of both author and translator assured the merit of the production. The book has doubtless done not a little to make the scholastic philosophy, especially in its recent development, more widely known, certainly amongst Catholics, and, it may be hoped, has served to remove some misunderstandings and dissolve some prejudices amongst non-Catholics. In the volume here introduced we are glad to welcome another auxiliary in the same

field—a welcome which is none the less warm from the circumstance that the book emanates from the press attached to Columbia University, a source from which we have not been accustomed to expect works expository much less laudatory of Catholic philosophy. It may also be added that the book is all the more welcome because it develops its subject from a viewpoint somewhat different from that of its predecessor before mentioned. Professor de Wulf has dealt more at length with the constitutive materials of mediæval scholasticism and has indicated the lines of its development present and prospective. Dr. Perrier has dwelt less upon that side of the subject and has given more in detail the story of the recent revival and growth of scholasticism. After delineating the several parts of the system—Logic, Metaphysics, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics—he follows the neo-scholastic movement in the various European countries, in the United States and in Canada. The delineation is suggestive both from a critical and a constructive standpoint; the narrative succinct, yet fairly comprehensive, and at the same time sympathetic in tone. On the whole the most valuable feature of the work is the bibliography. The list extends to eighty-seven pages—about one-third of the volume. It would be difficult to find anywhere else so comprehensive a catalogue of the best pertinent books and papers. Indeed, the list if anything is too abundant; it would suffer nothing by some eliminations, while here and there a title might well have been added. This minutia, however, as also a few infelicities of diction and typographical oversights, will no doubt be provided for in a future edition. The book is one which no serious student of philosophy will care to be without, and it certainly should be found in the library of every Catholic seminary and college. Will it get a place in the public libraries? It ought to.

HANDBOOK OF CANON LAW. For Congregations of Women Under Simple Vows. By *D. I. Lanslots, O. S. B.* 12mo., pp. 280. Frederick Pustet & Co., New York.

The internal discipline of the Church is receiving unusual attention in recent years. It is a healthy sign. It makes for better order and better results, and it indicates a permanent growth. The make-up of the book before us is thus explained:

"Religious communities are the chosen portion of the fold of Christ; in them Christian virtue and evangelical perfection should shine forth in all their splendor. The Church has at various times adopted suitable measures to enable them to continue on that high plane. The multitude of laws and regulations affecting them became, however, in course of time, a source of doubts and difficulties.

It was, above all, necessary for the preservation of order and harmony, which must prevail in every society, that the authority of the superiors of the congregations and that of the Bishops over them should be well defined. In order to respect each other's rights both should know the law.

"In order to prevent all future conflict, Pope Leo XIII. promulgated on December 8, 1900, the constitution, '*Conditae a Christo*,' in which he determines on one hand the rights of the Bishop in regard to institutions of simple vows, whether diocesan or non-diocesan, and on the other hand the rights and duties of superiors towards diocesan authority. This document, of the greatest importance, fixed the canonical legislation as applying to congregations of simple vows, but only in its main outlines, and needed a supplement to regulate the details of a practical organization. This supplement we find in the '*Normae*' or rules which the Sacred Congregation of Regulars is wont to follow in the approbation of new congregations of simple vows.

"The '*Handbook*' principally rests on this double foundation. We have not failed, however, to give the latest decisions of the Roman Congregations. Although written for congregations of women, the '*Handbook*' applies also to congregations of Brothers with simple vows, with the exception of the articles concerning postulants, examinations of candidates by the Bishop before taking the habit and before profession, dowry, extraordinary and ordinary confessors, the enclosure, the parlor, the dwelling of the chaplain, the presidency of the Bishop at the general chapter."

The work is well arranged and easily consulted. Everything is clearly stated, which adds very much to its value, for it is not for canonists only or principally, but rather for those who are not supposed to have any technical knowledge of canon law.

THE LIFE OF ST. MELANIA. By *His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla*. Translated by E. Leahy and edited by Herbert Thurston, S. J. 12mo., pp. 164. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

When this book first came from the Vatican Press, with contemporary documents and notes, with Latin and Greek texts, and with facsimiles, etc., it was a work of such erudition as to cause not only admiration, but surprise. Admiration because it was a model of its kind; surprise that its author should possess literary ability equal to his diplomatic power.

To translate the whole monograph in its entirety just as Cardinal Rampolla has given it to the world would require a volume of more than a thousand octavo pages, neither would the vast array of biblio-

graphical references and many of the minute points of erudition upon which the author spends so much space and learning have any interest for the general reader. Those who are keen about investigating such details are usually in a position to study the original for themselves without difficulty. At the same time the illustrious author, amid other matters of diversified interest, has incorporated in his work a straightforward summary of the history of St. Melania and her times, which in the opinion of the translator and friends whom she consulted, it was well worth while to render accessible to an English public. With the generous permission of His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla, this has been attempted in the present volume.

It would be a mistake to suppose, however, that the life as translated is at all incomplete. It is well rounded out. As to its interest there can be no doubt. A glance at the main facts is sufficient to show it.

St. Melania was born in A. D. 383, and died in 439. She spent her early life, of which a full account is given, in Rome, traveled all over the Roman world, and finally settled in Jerusalem, where she met St. Jerome in his declining years. The life consequently belongs to that extraordinarily interesting period of the break up of paganism and the early incursions of the barbarians, the last days of Roman greatness before Constantinople became the permanent centre of empire. The narrator writes as one who had been the devoted servant of the saint, who had accompanied her and her husband in some of their wanderings, and who finally became a priest and inmate of an affiliated religious establishment in Jerusalem, the association embracing both monks and nuns (like the double monasteries of England a few centuries later), of which St. Melania was both foundress and superior.

Father Thurston's preface of ten pages and Cardinal Rampolla's introduction of sixteen are in exceptional harmony with the text, and really add to the value of the book. The whole is a splendid example of biographical history in its best form, and may well serve as a model.

THE DAWN OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND, 1781-1803. By *Bernard Ward, F. R. Hist. S.*, president of St. Edmund's College. In two volumes, 8vo., pp. 370 and 316, illustrated. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York.

We have here a very important contribution to English church history. Much has been written and much more remains to be written of the planting and growth and decadence and revival of the faith in England. Each new contribution has a special value, and the one before us is unusually important. As the author says:

"The period of nearly a quarter of a century dealt with in the

present volumes may be considered the most important of all, for it was during this time that it may be fairly said that the tide turned when the gradual shrinkage of the Catholic body which had been proceeding steadily for over two centuries ceased, and a future began to open out before the Catholics of England in a manner to which their forefathers had been strangers. This period may therefore be appropriately called the dawn of the Catholic revival which has been proceeding ever since. The number and variety of influences at work, the abolition of the penal laws, the influx of the French refugee clergy, the return of our colleges and convents to English soil and other influences as well, combine to fill it with instructive historical lessons. It has been endeavored to present a history of the English Catholic body in general, together with a detailed account of their development in London and the home counties—the old ‘London District,’ as it was called. For obvious reasons no attempt has been made to describe the Catholic missions throughout the country. In many cases this has been done by books published locally by priests of the missions they concern; in at least one instance a whole county has been covered in a single book.”

Much courage was required on the part of the author who would undertake to review the events of that quarter of a century. Much learning also, and much labor. During that period event crowded event so closely that the chronicler must be a man of sharp vision, cool judgment and clear mind to be able to record them. Mgr. Ward possesses all the qualities for the work in an eminent degree, and therefore he manages his material so well as to produce an admirable history of a momentous period.

BIOGRAPHIES OF ENGLISH CATHOLICS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. By *Rev. John Kirk, D. D.* Being part of his projected continuation of “*Dodd’s Church History.*” Edited by John Hungerford Pollen, S. J., and Edwin Burton, D. D., F. R. Hist. S. 12mo., pp. 293, illustrated. Burns & Oates, London. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

Here is a splendid addition to Catholic biographical literature, which contains so many names not yet recorded in accessible form. The sketches are necessarily brief, but very interesting and full of surprises. The book will be of immense value to literary men especially. The following account of its history is interesting:

“For those who are at all familiar with the history of the English Catholics in the early years of the last century there will be little, if any need of a formal introduction to the Rev. John Kirk. All our larger Catholic archives preserve papers from his pen, his manuscript collections have been cited by numerous authors, and but for the almost insuperable obstacles of his times, the great his-

tory which he projected might have been carried out and his name as an author might already have been notable for nearly a century.

"From about the year 1776, when as a student in Rome he discovered a copy of Dodd's 'Church History' among the books of the English College, his ambition was to continue that great work from 1688 to his own time. With this object in view, he labored for more than fifty years to gather from all sources information as to the history of the Catholic Church in England during the eighteenth century.

"He wrote and copied, he bound up loose papers, and his MS. series of volumes entitled 'Collectanea Anglo-Catholica' grew to considerable dimensions. Yet he was never able to complete the undertaking he had projected in his youth. He grew old in collecting the material, and the history of the English Catholics in the eighteenth century remains unwritten.

"Yet his labors have not been unproductive of results. To say nothing of his large manuscript collections, an invaluable source for future historians, which but for his industry might have been lost, we have the collection of lives now given to the public. Dodd has included in his history chapters on the 'Lives of Bishops,' 'Lives of Peers,' 'Lives of Secular Clergymen,' etc., and Kirk had not only accepted and somewhat amplified the idea, but actually carried this part of the plan into execution, and was able to write on the last page 'Finis, April 7, 1841.'"

LETTERS ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. (Second Series.) The Seven Sacraments. Part II.—The Sacrament of Extreme Unction and Last Rites, the Sacrament of Holy Orders and the Sacrament of Matrimony. By F. M. De Zulueta, S. J. 12mo., pp. 275. R. & T. Washbourne, London. Benziger Brothers. New York.

This is indeed an exhaustless subject. We cannot have too many explanations of Christian doctrine, provided that they really explain, and provided that they are suited to the capacity of those for whom they are intended. The previous volumes of the work before us had these two qualities. By way of introduction to the present volume the author says:

"In laying before his many kind readers the second installment of 'Letters' on the Seven Sacraments, the author wishes to remind them once again that these volumes on Christian doctrine in no way pretend to form a complete manual of theology. Although they may prove of use to busy priests by supplying ready materials for instruction to their people, yet their main purpose is to popularize theology for the laity, and particularly for lay or non-priestly instructors.

"In the present volume it has, of course, been necessary to deal

with that increasingly momentous sacrament, Holy Matrimony. The author has been fully conscious of the delicacy of this part of his subject, but not less alive to the slender instructions concerning it so often to be noticed even among Catholics.

"Now, here it would have been quite easy and far more pleasant to deal in mere pious generalities. But such policy seemed utterly useless in a work of practical instruction, and even unconscientious, if not misleading.

"On the whole, then, it seemed to the author that his choice lay not between silence and speech, but between an endeavor on the one hand to convey a sufficient knowledge of Catholic moral principles, and on the other withholding a needful antidote to the false notions that are current at the present time."

He adopted the latter course, and the result justifies his resolution. He has the happy and rare faculty of speaking on delicate subjects without giving offense, and yet in an informing way.

THOUGHTS OF THE HEART. By *P. M. Northcote, O. S. M.*, author of "Consolamini," "The Bond of Perfection," etc. 12mo., pp. 288. Benziger Brothers, New York.

The book is a collection of short essays which may be used as meditations, or short instructions, or foundations for sermons. They are notable for the wide field which they cover, and also for their originality and unction. The compiler offers this word of explanation:

"The expression 'Thoughts of the Heart' is frequently made use of in Holy Scripture. The phrase is a beautiful one, implying as it does that not only is the mind occupied in ruminating the secret and hidden things of God's wisdom, but furthermore that from the meditation of heavenly truths the heart is awakened to elicit corresponding aspirations towards God.

"These are truly 'Thoughts of the Heart,' for the same consoling and helpful friendship which moved the author to produce his book of meditations entitled 'Consolamini' is responsible also for this new volume, which is in truth but a continuation of the former.

"Moreover, they are essentially 'Thoughts of the Heart' from the manner of their composition, since they are written upon no preconsidered system, but just according as some idea presented itself to the author's mind, calling forth a corresponding elevation of the heart towards the Infinite Being, from whom all light and warmth proceed. In compiling them, however, for publication, I have endeavored where possible to observe some sort of rough sequence.

"Perhaps they are not, strictly speaking, meditations, but rather

short spiritual readings. I have nevertheless, divided the different subjects into three or four points for the sake of those who choose to make use of the book as a manual of meditation."

TRAVAIL ET FOLIE. Influences professionnelles sur l'étiologie psychopathique. Drs. A. Marie et R. Martial. One vol. in 16. Bibliothèque de Psychologie expérimentale et de métapsychie. Bloud, éditeur, 7 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

The relations subsisting between labor and insanity present a problem which calls in question several notions which though practically considered as settled, are always open to discussion in a philosophical point of view.

The authors of this new book do not maintain that in this or that particular case labor is the cause of insanity. Every disease, whether mental or of another kind, is occasioned by multiple causes, and in each case each of the causes occupies a place of different and variable importance in the totality of causes whence the disorder is derived. What these writers endeavor to decide is what part in the etiological totality of causes giving rise to "psychosis" is to be attributed to manual or intellectual labor on the one hand, and on the other, what is the proportion or percentage of laborers afflicted with "psychosis" as compared with the sum total of laborers in general and as compared with the sum total of laborers in each profession.

This work, then, chiefly consists of the elaboration of documents. But it will comprise in addition some amount of scientific discussion and reasoning, since the etiology of certain psychopathies entails the examination of some opinions accepted or about to be accepted on the subject of vesanic etiology.

This book supplies a want long felt in medico-psychological literature, being the first work that enters deeply into the question at issue, while basing its conclusions on a plentiful amount of observation.

LA THEOLOGIE SCOLASTIQUE ET LA TRANSCENDANCE DU SURNATUREL. Par H. Ligeard, professeur d'apologétique à l'école de théologie de Lyon-Francheville. One vol. in 16. De viii.+138 pages. Librairie Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, rue de Rennes, 117, Paris.

This little volume is devoted to the study of the very difficult, but very actual question of the transcendence or of the immanence of the supernatural. The theologians of the schools had already treated this question from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century. In solving it M. Ligeard saw what an advantage would be found in the study of their teaching. The first three chapters deal with the different theories professed on the subject in the Thomist, Scotist

and Augustinian schools. He easily shows how the scholastic theologians, while admitting a relation of harmony or of mutual sympathy between the natural and the supernatural, are still radically opposed to the doctrine of immanence. This part of the study is very strictly objective; the author confines himself to the task of putting the texts before the reader, and his work, taken from these sources, is therefore from first hand. In the last chapter M. Ligeard endeavors to make use of this doctrine of the school in order to settle the problem of the transcendence of the supernatural. In his opinion it would be a very useful undertaking to draw up a rational and philosophical analysis of the complete activities of man—intelligence, heart and will—with a view to the refutation of the theory of religious immanence and naturalism. Such a work would be in entire conformity with the teaching of the school. It would be a psychological preparation that would serve as an introduction to the objective and historical demonstration of the reality of Revelation. In treating this point the author has taken especial pains to point out with precision his personal views, carefully distinguishing them from what he considers as a mere imitation of previous methods. This book appears as a notable contribution to those apologetic studies which are carried on in a method which is at once progressive and traditional.

THE VIA VITAE OF ST. BENEDICT. The Holy Rule Arranged for Mental Prayer. By *Dom Bernard Hayes*, Monk of the English Benedictine Congregation. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. J. C. Hedley, O. S. B., Bishop of Newport. 12mo., pp. 352. Benziger Brothers, New York.

Those who are accustomed to the ordinary books of meditation, with their carefully mapped out introductions of various kinds, will be surprised when they open this book at its excellence and simplicity. Its excellence is referred to by Bishop Hedley in these words:

"The idea of this book is a good one, and it will be welcomed by many members of the Benedictine family and others. A series of devout meditations on the rule of St. Benedict is virtually a novelty at the present day; for although in past times pious affections and elevations on the holy rule have been given to the world by one or other of its numerous commentators, they are not easily accessible in a form adapted for use. Moreover, the present publication aims at providing the reader with materials for pursuing that 'brief and pure' method of prayer which is recommended by St. Benedict himself."

Its simplicity is accounted for by the absence from St. Benedict's rule of any formal instructions concerning mental prayer or medita-

tion in the ordinary sense of the word. This is a surprise to one who hears it for the first time. And yet it is true.

"The holy Patriarch gives no explicit instruction how to pray. To him as to those Fathers of the Eastern Church and of the desert, whose traditions he carried on, 'prayer' is simply the speech of the heart with God. Vocal prayer or psalmody was to fill up a large portion each day, and mental prayer was to continue as far as possible during all the waking hours not occupied by Divine Office. In St. Benedict's time there was no fixed time for 'meditation'—no hour or half hour in which the whole community knelt in their places in church and devoted themselves to the exercise of mental prayer. A monk, as far as possible, should pray always."

Hence we find the book divided into chapters composed of quotations from the rule in Latin and English, thoughts suggested by the quotations, and prayers. It is a very simple arrangement, and ought to be very effective, for there is no waste or confusion of words. A text, a short, clear analysis of the text, and prayer.

L'EVOLUTION PSYCHIQUE DE L'ENFANT. Par *Dr. Henri Bouquet*. One vol. in 16. Bibliothèque de Psychologie expérimentale et de métapsychie. Bloud, éditeur, 7 place Saint-Sulpice, Paris.

Dr. Henri Bouquet, psychologist and specialist in diseases of children, expounds in this volume the results of his personal experience concerning the evolution of human mentality in the first years of life. The moment of birth and the first sensations of life are analyzed. He then treats of the appearance of the first manifestations of sense-activity—sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch. Walking and speaking are mental manifestations of a more complex nature and a more spiritual kind. Finally the author treats directly the psychology of little children—habit, memory, life of the affections, fear, imagination, fetichism, asthetic sense, etc.

This book, filled with the most learned experiences, deals with a question deeply interesting not only to the specialist, but also to fathers and mothers as well as those who are occupied with matters of education or training of infant minds.

EPITOME EX EDITIONE VATICANA GRADUALIS ROMANI, quod hodiernae musicae signis tradidit *Dr. Fr. X. Mathias*, Regens Seminarii et Professor Musicae Sacrae in Academia Wilhelmina, Argentiniensi. Neoboraci: Fred. Pustet.

"The Epitomy of the Vatican Edition of the Roman Gradual," by Dr. Francis X. Mathias, recently published by the Pustets, makes a very handsome and satisfying book. It is correct, of course, but in addition to that it should be said that it is correctly made in the material sense, being well printed on good paper of a light weight and strongly bound. It is just the book for practical use.

70766

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

